DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 608	08	CE 011 811

AUTHOR	Hensley, Gene; Schulman, Mark
TITLE	Two Studies on the Role of Business & Industry and Labor Participation in Career Education: Enhancing Business and Industry Participation in Career Education; Issues and Strategies for Enhancing the Participation of Labor in the Implementation of Career Education.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council for Career Education, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 77
NOTE	131p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01737-7)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes; *Career Education; *Change Strategies; Cooperative Programs; Educational Objectives; Educational Theories; *Labor Unions; Participation; *School Industry Relationship; *Work Experience Programs

ABSTRACT

The first paper contained in this document, entitled "Enhancing Business and Industry Participation in Career Education," addresses the following topics: Interrelationships between business, industry and schools, issues in strengthening the collaboration of education and business and industry, problems and possibilities of increased interaction, and strategies for increasing the participation of business and industry in career education. The second paper, entitled "Issues and Strategies for Enhancing the Participation of Labor in the Implementation of Career Education," is based on research conducted with labor organizations, educators, and the literature on career education. The paper approaches the relationship between career education and labor in two ways: The issues behind the relationship are discussed on theoretical, conceptual, and operational levels, and strategies to consolidate and/or modify the "action" plan of labor participation in career education are explored. Short-range implementation suggestions are made and long-range implications are discussed. In the concluding section, issues and strategies are brought together in an assessment of the future prospects of career education in relation to past realities and present possibilities. (TA)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED141608

TWO STUDIES ON THE ROLE OF BUSINESS & INDUSTRY AND LABOR PARTICIPATION IN CAREER EDUCATION

Prepared for the
National Advisory Council for Career Education

ENHANCING BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY PARTICIPATION IN CAREER EDUCATION

by

Gene Hensley
Associate Director
Elementary/Secondary Education Department
Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado

and

ISSUES AND STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING THE PARTICIPATION OF LABOR IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION

by

Mark Schulman
Assistant Professor
Communication Studies
Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 011 811

PREFACE

A considerable portion of each agenda of the National Advisory Council for Career Education is devoted to assessing the various means by which the identifiable knowledge gaps in career education can be closed. The result has been the commissioning of two series of papers on a wide variety of topics. Several of the papers from the first series were published in 1976, e.g., those dealing with the emerging history and the efficacy of career education.

A second series of papers were commissioned in 1976, again, on a broad number of career education concerns. The document in your hands is one of those submitted to the Council in either late 1976 and early 1977.

At the April 6, 1977 meeting of the Council, a substantial amount of time was spent discussing these papers. A motion was passed unaminously to reflect the position to which the Council strongly adheres, namely, that it is healthy to have different points of view on career education and that the promotion of these differing views is a very positive step in the life of career education. We sincerely believe that the dissemination of these papers is, indeed, a very salutary action in the furtherance of the career education debate.

This does not and should not imply that the National Advisory Council for Career Education accepts and endorses all the concepts, ideas, suggestions and recommendations in the papers we are now disseminating. We disagree with opinions expressed in several of these papers. This document, rather, reflects the realization that the Council has identified certain goals and issues and that we wish to make available for reading, and, to be sure, thought-provoking discussion, this set of commissioned papers which directly explore these goals and issues.

Our intent, as we have indicated, has been to close some of the existing knowledge and philosophical gaps in the field. We trust this document will contribute toward that end.

George F. Meyer, Jr.
Chairperson

May 20, 1977

This report is published under provisions of Public Law 93-380, Section 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974.

The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

National Advisory Council for Career Education, June 1977

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Stock No. 017-080-01737-7

ENHANCING BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY PARTICIPATION IN CAREER EDUCATION

Gene Hensley
Education Commission of the States

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

Interrelationships Between Business, Industry and Schools. 5

Issues in Strengthening the Collaboration of Education and Business and Industry. 16

Problems and Possibilities of Increased Interaction. . 23

Strategies for Increasing the Participation of Business and Industry in Career Education. 28

Bibliography 37

INTRODUCTION

While there are signs of a growing acceptance of career education among both educators and laymen, millions of people have never heard of it. There is, however, strong federal support at both the legislative and program levels, and there have been efforts to infuse career education concepts into curricula at all grade levels. As a result, career education has not only become an important element of public schooling, it has increased in momentum for several years in response to the general dissatisfaction with education expressed by parents, students, politicians and members of business, industry and labor. Whether or not career education will sustain its momentum in the years ahead or simply take its place alongside other efforts that have failed will depend largely on (1) the extent to which leaders in business and industry continue to accept career education as a promising means of blending education and work in ways that will make schooling more productive and satisfying, and (2) the extent to which business and education are able to strengthen their partnership for bridging the gap between education and work.

In recent years a number of developments have strengthened the case for a new relationship between education and work. The growth of cooperative education, paralleled by a widespread recognition of the importance of combining educational experience and work experience in on-the-job settings, has resulted in a renewed interest in collaborative efforts between education and business and industry to make education more relevant. Indeed, the time is long overdue for communities and states to bring education and work together as a logical objective of schooling and to make careers a major goal of education at all levels. Effective national, state and local policies to carry this out have been slow in developing. Although the program elements for such policies have been introduced in thousands of communities and there are many career education programs now in existence that involve collaborative efforts of business and education, still lacking is any precise knowledge of alternative ways in which exemplary programs may be replicated. Such knowledge must include the state and local variables that impede or facilitate program implementation, as well as the means for enhancing the participation of business, industry and education in order to ensure continuity of schooling and work from elementary through postsecondary levels for all students, whether their goal is to become a farmer, welder, philosopher, physician or a member of Congress.

Given the scope of this agenda, it is little wonder that career education has entered the mainstream of educational innovation. In particular, career education has now become the primary means both within education and among leaders in business and industry for remedying the artificial, unnecessary and unproductive separation of schooling and work. Much of what has happened is readily apparent. A discussion paper recently published by the Education Commission of the States noted that:

> . . . all too many students look forward neither to school nor to work. Partly because they have seldom experienced making real choices . . . and partly because they feel that the deck is stacked against them and that they have no choices available, they often feel trapped and lost. With infrequent chances to practice or experience making decisions of real consequences, and with little or no training in developing decision-making skills, they drift aimlessly, evidencing alienation and bitterness with respect to both school and work.
>
> . . . the community often lacks any sense of purpose and power to bring about changes needed in either the school structure or the work structure. Both are frequently seen, perhaps without reason but often with mistrust and vehemence . . . as self serving, unapproachable bureaucracies in league against both parents and children. "The school doesn't teach my kid what he needs to get a job, and the world of work doesn't have a place for him anyhow." But what can parents . . . especially a poor person or minority, do about it? Rarely does anyone ask their advice or even inquire into their feelings. (ECS Report No. 91, 1976)

While this is not the whole picture, many children and young adults can identify with it closely. It may be true that some children and adolescents do experience the world of work through work experience both in and outside the home. It may also be true that at high school and college levels some young persons become familiar with the requirements of employers and with the tasks that must be completed successfully (for example, thousands of students participate in unpaid volunteer programs and get the feel for what is required in a work-oriented society). But the gap persists and it appears to be growing. In the opinion of many, only a renewed collaborative effort on the part of education and business and industry can solve the problem.

The rationale for increasing cooperation between education and business and industry in support of career education is frequently tied to specific issues such as school dropouts and the apparent discrepancy between the requirements of employers and the quality of education. Foremost, however, are issues related to the changing meaning of work and the appallingly high rate of unemployment among 16-19-year olds, especially minorities. Here are the facts:

- Since 1956 the teenage share of the labor force has increased from 6.5 percent to just over 9 percent.
- The number of persons in the 16-19 age group who are looking for work is outpacing this country's ability to provide jobs.
- Unemployment figures for youth have received less attention than the unemployment of the 25-64 age group (probably because these are the breadwinners), but the rate of youth unemployment is at least three times as high as the rate for the total labor force. To add to this problem, unemployed youth are a great deal more numerous among minorities. The following chart gives some indication of the comparative rate of unemployment for the youth of this nation.

TABLE I. YOUTH AND THE WORKING FORCE. 1980-2000*
(Number in Millions)

Age Group	1960	1970	1975	1980	1985	2000	
15-19	13.3	19.3	20.9	20.0	17.6	20.9	(est.)
20-24	10.8	17.2	19.3	21.2	20.3	19.8	(est.)
25-64	83.2	90.2	97.0	105.9	115.5	135.8	
Total Population	179	205	217	225	236	264	(est.)
Ratio							
15-19/25-64	.16	.21	.22	.19	.15	.15	
20-24/25-64	.13	.19	.20	.20	.17	.15	

Robert Havinghurst has pointed out that the number of persons reaching the age of 18 reached 4 million in 1972 and will continue at that rate until at least 1979. After this, the figure will drop because of the decreasing birth rate since 1965. (Personal correspondence, 1976) It is interesting to note that the current rate of youth unemployment is as great as or greater than it was in the 1930s during the Great Depression. The obvious implication is that without major changes in education and in the employment and recruiting practices of business and industry, employers will be unable to meet the demands of youth for paid positions.

---

*U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports Series P-25, No. 480. April, 1972. Table 7, p. 17. Assumptions: Fertility Rate at 2.110 (replacement level); Immigration, 400,000 per year; slight increase in mortality.

Change in the meaning of work is no less a problem than high unemployment statistics. While issues related to the meaning of work have not been analyzed cooperatively by business, industry and education, some recent research should be of special interest to career educators and to all others who support career education concepts. A study conducted by Gottleib (1974) found that college seniors hold positive attitudes toward work. While work is considered an essential part of a person's life, it is generally perceived as a great deal more than earning money, gaining status or simply serving as a means to an end. It must be satisfying to the individual and valuable to others. Important to career education is the expectation that careers cannot be separated from other aspects of a persons life. Studies by Gottleib (1974) and by Yankelovich (1972) support the notion that students, in their work attitudes, see themselves as different from their parents. Parents are perceived as placing more importance on salary, personal attainment, security and related factors, while students are more concerned with the purpose of work, with whether it is interesting and whether it allows for personal fulfillment. Furthermore, other research has found that there are also differences in work attitudes among various groups of youth. Studies by Yankelovich (1972), Davis (1969) and others suggest that social class, ethnicity and sex differences are particularly important. While these facts are not surprising, they are important considerations when planning for the implementation of career education and for the participation of business and industry in the process.

The importance of these comments is not so much that recent data suggest that youth unemployment is increasing. Most persons know this, including students and potential employers. What is more important is that changes in work ethics are placing increased demands on work and on all who participate in it. As perceived by the present generation, work must be significant; it should not be merely something you do in order to live. Work should not be viewed as isolated from the rest of one's life or as separated from one's education. It should be a major source for enhancing one's total experience. Thus, if career education is to be successful, then all efforts to link education and work through the collaborative efforts of education and business and industry must be evaluated within the contexts of youth unemployment and the changing meaning of work.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BUSINESS, INDUSTRY AND SCHOOLS

Leaders in business and industry and others outside of education are interested in career education for many of the same reasons expressed by educators who have become identified with the effort. They stress the idea that career education is needed to reduce the gap between unrealistic education programs and career needs (Career Education and the Businessman, Chamber of Commerce, 1973). Specifically, they cite such problems as the high dropout rate (only 76 percent of all students enrolled in secondary schools actually graduate), the imbalance between students enrolled in college preparatory programs as opposed to those enrolled in vocational education programs, and the relatively small number of students (23 percent of secondary students) who actually graduate from college (Digest of Educational Statistics).

Where career education programs exist in business or where relationships between business and education have been formalized, there is the realization that career education will not exclusively occur within the four walls of a school building. Where significant partnerships between education and business have developed, there is a tendency for these relationships to grow and expand over a relatively short period of time. In other words, career education is collectively viewed as a team effort once the representatives of business, industry and education discover that collaborative efforts can be mutually beneficial. Admittedly, many business and industrial leaders have limited experience, if any, with career education concepts, but that is also true in many areas of education. The important point is that there are many cases of major involvement of business and industry in career education programs, and many examples of cooperative efforts that have gone considerably beyond a participatory relationship. Among these are the following:

Chamber of Commerce of the United States

The national chapter has taken a strong position in support of career education. It supports the concept of a career education team and serves as a valuable resource for practical information on organizing and starting career education programs. It supports the idea that business, labor and professional groups, in addition to education, should take the initiative in implementing career education programs.

Booker T. Washington Foundation

This foundation has been involved in career education (1) through a subcontract with the Department of Housing and

Urban Development to set up housing management training programs on college campuses and (2) by assisting in the establishment of the Miami Valley Manpower Consortium/Garfield Skills Center Cable training program in Dayton, Ohio.

Business and Professional Women's Foundation

The Business and Professional Women's Foundation has supported a career awareness project providing opportunities for schools and communities to cooperate in the development of activities that foster various career exploration activities among students throughout the United States. The Business and Professional Women's Foundation (BTW) calls for the collaboration of school and community in guidance program development to ensure that all available resources will be utilized in the transition from education to work. The Business and Professional Women's Foundation (BPW) administers research, fellowship and scholarship programs and maintains a special library of materials on working women.

American Society for Training and Development

The American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) is composed of more than 18,000 members at national and chapter levels who are responsible for personnel development, training and education programs throughout business, industry, government and the professions. This organization publishes a wide range of materials directly related to career education concepts.

Joint Council on Economic Education

Most council programs are collaborative efforts of educators, business and labor, but they place special emphasis on community-oriented activities. The council is interested in providing an understanding of world of work economics and its relationship to career education. For the past several years they have conducted conferences throughout the United States on curriculum strategies, instructional materials and sources of information for school systems interested in economic education.

National Association of Manufacturers

The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) advocates that qualified persons be designated at federal, state and local levels to coordinate and encourage cooperation between business and industry and education. In recent months they have released several publications that deal directly with the need for such cooperation. Among these are the NAM public policy report, which addresses the role of the Industry Education Coordinator, in a handbook that provides guidelines for the establishment of industry/education councils; and a procedural outline for industry/education workshops focused on improved cooperation of business and education.

National Association of Trade and Technical Schools

The National Association of Trade and Technical Schools (NATTS) is an association of approximately 400 private vocational schools that are basically job-oriented institutions. They are involved in a variety of programs and projects that link secondary education with employment. Of special interest is a directory listing local schools that are members of this organization.

Niagara Frontier Industry Education Councils, Inc.

The Niagara Frontier Industry Education Council conducts a variety of activities related to career education concepts and activities. Included are:

- Special workshops on occupational awareness that stress meeting of teaching personnel with business personnel.
- A resource bank that lists names of speakers available to classroom teachers.
- High school internships whereby secondary school students are released for a semester to work with business executives.
- Teacher exchange days when teachers spend time to experience a typical working day and teacher exchange days when teachers spend time working in local area companies.

Business Industry Community Education Partnership

One of the more unique and effective collaborative organizations associated with career education is the Business Industry Community Education Partnership (BICEP). Based in Salt Lake City, it was created to provide students with opportunities to explore career interest on a first-hand basis. Participants include business and industrial representatives in the Salt Lake region who provide classroom speakers, plant and office tours and internships. They also publish a variety of career reference materials. BICEP maintains a central resource file and responds routinely to requests for information having to do with their stated purpose. The project involves approximately 130,000 students in kindergarten through the twelfth grade and is available to all students in the metropolitan Salt Lake City area.

International Telephone and Telegraph

IT&T has disseminated a variety of publications stressing the importance of business and industry taking leadership in preparing students for work. The emphasis is on developing a two-way communication process between leaders in education and industry.

Husky Oil Company

Husky has a summer school and work program in its Cody, Wyoming office that provides summer employment and an opportunity to learn directly about the intricacies of business. Of significance is a special course entitled "Introduction to Business" in which more than 30 volunteers give students an introduction to various career opportunities available in the oil industry. The rationale for this program focuses on the widening gap between skills required for employment in the oil industry and the capacity of educational institutions to provide such skills without the collaborative efforts of industry.

American Telephone and Telegraph Company

The American Telephone and Telegraph Company has established a policy that stresses the importance of cooperating with schools on a variety of educational projects. More than 300 persons are assigned full time to educationally related positions. In recent years AT&T has become involved in career education through a variety of programs that range from elementary through secondary levels. At the national level AT&T, along with other cooperations, has sought support for increased collaborative activities in career education.

The National Alliance of Businessmen

The National Alliance of Businessmen was established in 1968. At the present time it operates in more than 100 urban communities throughout the United States and stresses the importance of preventing unemployment among disadvantaged youth. Programs included are:

- Guided Opportunities for Life Decisions (GOLD) program. This is a work study program that involves collaborative efforts between industry and local schools.
- Youth Motivated Task Force (YMFT) brings together businessmen and businesswomen from disadvantaged backgrounds and disadvantaged secondary level students.
- College Cluster Program is focused on helping colleges serving minority youth to infuse liberal arts education with professional training to better prepare students for entering the labor market.

General Motors Corporation

The General Motors Corporation recently approved a corporate policy dealing with their support of the career education concept. This statement arose from a number of activities between education and General Motors plants. Primary in this activity were field experiences, internships and classroom speakers.

Recognizing that additional effort must be made in coordinating these resources between the various school districts, a series of workshops have been initiated in Michigan. The prototype for these workshops will be used nationally in each General Motors Plant city. The format is briefly an opportunity for educators, General Motors executives and representatives of either Chamber of Commerce or other industries in that region to sit down with organized labor and jointly determine what their support of local career education will be. At this time educators determine how they will also fit into the program. These workshops provide a basis for collaboration and development of a model for the management of the industrial/labor resources. At this writing one workshop has been held in Kalamazoo, Michigan with the remaining workshops being scheduled for the near future.

Gates Rubber Company

Gates has for many years been actively involved in various cooperative activities with education including cooperative education, internships and a regular tour program. The company is also active in a variety of advisory councils at state, local and national levels involving curriculum assessment versus industry needs.

American Motors

American Motors has been involved in a variety of career education efforts over the past several years. At the elementary, junior high and senior high levels, they have worked with the Milwaukee public schools in their "Expansion for Educational Experience" program. This program integrates visits to organizations with classroom content. At the postsecondary level, American Motors has provided visits to the classrooms of a number of colleges and universities in the area. At Alverno College, for example, there is a broad-based career education effort in which AMC has participated that includes off-campus experience for students, career days, etc.

The Zenith Program at Daniel Hale Williams University

Daniel Hale Williams University is a new institution (founded in 1974) that stresses the importance of opening up educational opportunities to all employees outside the institution regardless of their earlier education background. Through a cooperative arrangement with Zenith, employees can increase their education or advance their job skills by enrolling in secondary or college level courses after working hours in the plant or office in which they work. Courses are conducted by university faculty. The goal is to provide Zenith employees with opportunities to qualify for improved positions in business and industry. Similar arrangements are anticipated to begin with other industries and business organizations.

Dupont

Dupont has developed a number of cooperative activities with various secondary and postsecondary institutions at the local level. Of special interest is a career education project in Delaware that involved the establishment of the Educational Resource Association as a non-profit public service organization to serve both public and private schools in that state. Specifically, its charge was to identify a variety of curriculum and career-related business resources and through a clearinghouse arrangement make speakers and field trips available to those who required them. A representative of Dupont and a teacher were loaned by their respective groups to facilitate the implementation of this project. This program has now expanded to a number of local districts in Delaware. More than 1200 resources from more than 200 organizations are now participating and more are currently being added.

Wells Fargo Bank (California)

Wells Fargo is preparing an educational opportunities catalogue for distribution to California residents. It is also involved in the preparation of materials that stress the importance of business/education relations in job satisfaction and effectiveness.

General Electric

General Electric is one of the most diversified companies in the corporate structure. It has decentralized into nine major cooperating groups. Worldwide employment at GE has been close to 400,000. Career education and related programs are many and varied in this giant corporation. Three current examples of career education programs include:

- Programs to Increase Minority Engineering Graduates (PIMEG). This program which has evolved into a national effort under the National Academy of Engineering, is aimed at encouraging talented minorities to become involved in better preparation for serving as engineers.

- Expo-Tech. A traveling exhibit program called Expo-Tech is one of the featured programs of GE. This program was planned to reach minority students at school levels where they are forced to make decisions regarding course selections. At the middle school or secondary level the Expo-Tech program introduces students to the world of engineering. The objectives are to inform students about the world of engineering, to enlist the support of counselors and teachers in communicating about engineering opportunities, and to create a national awareness of the need for more minority engineers.

- World of Work - Communications. GE has mounted a program to publicize career education in a way that is responsive to the values of students. The purpose of the program is to stimulate student interest through student-oriented advertising. Publications of this project reach an estimated 15,000,000 students. GE programs stress the need for better industry/education/labor and government relations at both the corporate and the local level. Career awareness, career information and career education are combined in a series of cooperative activities designed to improve the collaborative activities of industry and education in the implementation of career education principles.

Since 1959 the General Electric Foundation has sponsored summer guidance programs in various universities to supplement education and increase its career guidance capability.

General Dynamics

General Dynamics currently participates in career education in work experience programs, both exploratory and paid. Exploratory programs are normally at the secondary level. This company has developed and implemented a variety of programs for minorities at the postsecondary level and serves as a resource for speakers and media progress in a large number of technical areas. Elementary teachers have been employed as counselor interns in special programs. Teachers have been placed in internships where they become acquainted with the special needs of industry. In addition to these activities, General Dynamics supports junior achievement programs and provides a variety of limited training experiences for secondary school students in the General Dynamics Pamona Division.

Mountain Bell

Mountain Bell has been extremely active in a number of career education efforts. The Denver Employment Office of Mountain Bell presented upon request almost 90 career education programs in the Denver metropolitan area in 1975-76. In addition, Mountain Bell is currently developing a career exploration presentation for young students (grades 2-3), utilizing publications especially prepared for that purpose. Mountain Bell has also published a descriptive brochure which outlines the purposes, benefits and value of career education to business and industry.

Shell Oil

Shell Oil currently conducts a number of active programs that include:

- Automotive Training Program (APT). This program was initiated in 1968 to stimulate, through creative learning experiences, the desire to finish high school, develop skills and provide qualification for further education. It has involved more than 60 secondary schools across the nation and has utilized materials developed from Shell Learning Systems.
- Continuing Education. This program is designed to provide business and community knowledge to postsecondary and adult students.
- University Advisory Committees. Representatives from Shell serve on a University of Houston Advisory committee that has as its objective obtaining input from business as to their position requirements.
- Sponsor for Educational Opportunity. Designed to help all students, this program assists students in preparing for college, (i.e., getting ready for the SAT and ACT; applying for financial aid, admissions, etc.). Emphasis is on the average students needs.
- Speakers Bureau. Shell makes available large numbers of speakers to high schools, community colleges and adult education programs.
- Vocational Office Education Program (VOE). Shell participates in the Vocational Office Education Program in an effort to bridge the gap between education and experience. In this program secondary school students spend one-half day in their regular school training and one-half day in the regular school program. This program has been in operation since 1971.

Kodak

The Kodak Colorado Division has been involved in career education for more than three years. They have developed a number of collaborative programs with the Windsor Colorado School system. Included are:

- The Work Experience Program. Kodak and the Windsor schools cosponsor the Student Industrial Development Program. This program has two dimensions. First, is a business office and education program in which seniors are provided an opportunity to explore various types of office positions. Students spend three hours a day, five days a week in this program, and are paid and receive credit. Second, students begin work during the summer between their junior and senior year. In the first 160 hours they receive training from instructors in the training shop. Included is instruction in shop practices, safety, etc.

- Summer Program for College Students. Students are hired for the summer as replacements for employees on vacation. Some work is in disciplines related to their special interests. Students are provided with career information about their chosen fields but are allowed to choose from other fields for additional involvement.

- Career Education Tours. Tours have been designed primarily for junior level students which involve (1) discussions of academic subjects and their relation to work; (2) planning for future career options; (3) simulations; and (4) opportunities to discuss special interests and employees.

- Career Education Policy Formulation. Various Kodak employees serve on State Advisory Committees and participate in local, state and national career education programs.

Other activities include working with colleges and universities to train counselors and community teams to facilitate career education involvement and procedures in developing industry/education teams.

Fisher Price Toys (Division of Quaker Oats)

Fisher Price and key personnel within the company have been instrumental in nurturing the development of the Niagara Frontier Project. Teachers and graduate counselors visit area industries, learn about position requirements and communicate with managers actively involved in the recruitment and training of youth.

National Association for Industry/Education Corporation

The National Association for Industry/Education Corporation (NAIEC) supported increased cooperation between industry, education and labor throughout 1975 and 1976. Committee activities related to career education concepts included staff development, curriculum development, educational management, teacher-student materials, affiliated councils and public information services. Activities included community resources workshops and liaison with national organizations with similar interests to explore cooperative projects.

State/Business-Industry Liaison

A survey of the state education agencies in regard to their collaborative activities with business and industry in implementing career education revealed that virtually all state career education coordinators have established liaison with the business/industry community. While the greatest amount of collaborative activity is at the local level (i.e., between local districts and local business or industries), states have established numerous relationships with businesses that have facilitated the expansion of business/education liaison at the local level. For example:

- Michigan has an outstanding career education program that stresses the importance of including business and industry in program implementation. The state department of education has worked closely with large numbers of small businesses and large corporations, such as Miller Farms and General Motors Corporation.

- In Delaware, the department of public instruction, in cooperation with the Dupont Company, Newark School District and other business and schools has established the Education Resources Association and has worked through a number of advisory councils on the collective concerns of business, labor, industry and education.

- Task forces in Arizona include representatives from labor, industry and business in identifying the long range objectives of career education. Most projects at local levels have utilized representatives from business and industry in various advisory capacities.

- Vermont has utilized industry councils extensively in identifying program objectives and in the implementation of programs.

- New Mexico utilized business and industry representatives in developing a booklet on "how to look for a job" and has cooperated with various Chambers of Commerce throughout the states in supporting career education concepts. In addition, New Mexico's career education advisory committee includes representatives from private industry.

- Washington - the office of public instruction has initiated planning for a career education community support system that will involve significant participation of business and industry as well as other communities.

- Oregon is involved in a four-state regional guidance project to identify career guidance competencies needed by business/industry and labor personnel as they work with public education programs. Follow-up services are planned to assist various groups in implementing these competencies.

ISSUES IN STRENGTHENING THE COLLABORATION OF EDUCATION AND BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Almost everyone feels that career education cannot be implemented without the increased participation of business and industry -- or, for that matter, the entire business/industry and labor community. The hundreds of articles, monographs and papers that have been published concerning business/industry/education relations since 1970 support this idea. Where states and local districts have actively sought the support of business in implementing their programs, they have moved far ahead of those who have not. In fact, it appears that it matters little who initiates the collaborative effort. A number of state coordinators have made the point that first steps at cooperative efforts are very often initiated by leaders in business or industry. In fact, business and industry has sometimes felt comfortable about a saleable product (career education) but have lacked buyers (education). This dilemma points directly to one of the most important issues in strengthening the participation of business and industry in the implementation process; that is, who should take the lead in planning for the implementation of career education?

If it is true that it matters little who leads in planning for the implementation of career education, why is this an issue? Unfortunately, the long-standing and artificial separation of education and work have caused bad habits to form. Education talks to education, business talks to business, government talks to government, and the interaction of these institutions on a systematic and planned basis is yet to become widespread. In effect, each community waits impatiently for the other to act. Kenneth Hoyt perhaps stated it best when he said that "the best way to begin is to begin." Certainly, he was not implying that the solution is simple. Instead he was simply pointing out that there will be little progress until someone takes the initiative. When a trustee, board member, legislator or business executive takes the problem in hand and pushes for a mutual effort to acquaint students, counselors, business leaders and others with the value of collaborative efforts, positive things will happen.

Even someone who is disassociated from direct involvement can be the catalyst in education. Granted, more progress will occur if persons with power, influence, or decision-making authority take it upon themselves to initiate a dialogue between all the relevant parties. Of equal importance perhaps is that these persons be aware of the political significance of bringing together those who have vested interests in education to address problems and possibilities for increased cooperation between business and education for the mutual benefit of all concerned. Clearly, the key to solving these problems and overcoming the barriers to increased cooperation between business and education centers on the traditional inability of these groups to communicate on topics where disagreement might be expected to occur. Important are such factors as the following:

- All parties must have some idea as to what increased collaborative efforts can accomplish.
- Proposed levels and types of collaborative activities must be identified and be recorded as to their significance for the particular discussion.
- Objectives and proposed outcomes must be mutually agreed upon before serious discussions begin.

Another issue is whether the interests of education and business/industry are compatible. This is a question of linkages. Fundamental to this issue are two subquestions. Is the proposed linkage a task-oriented partnership that implies an action-oriented objective? Or is the linkage one wherein the basic objective is to develop a partnership to facilitate general communication between business and education? (Sampieri, Career Education National Forum, 1975) A variety of other questions deserves consideration. Most have to do with individual and group motives for initiating or agreeing to consider some types of cooperative effort to bridge the gap between private enterprise and public education. Basic to most of these questions is the idea that the interests of both education and business must be served. This type of symbiotic relationship is not new to education and certainly not a new departure for business or industry. It is political; it involves negotiations, compromise and a recognition that vested interest groups (including both education and business) do not achieve their objectives without a clear understanding of alternatives, courses of action and factors that may strengthen or decrease existing cooperative efforts.

A third issue is whether institutionalized educational offerings can be coordinated with the opportunities which now exist for work and employment. Earlier it was said that there is a crisis in education, a dissatisfaction with formal education as it now exists at all levels, and failing confidence in education in general. One has only to review the paper, watch the evening news or read a magazine to get a feel for the lost prestige of education among the American public. In general, there is the feeling that more flexible arrangements for alternating education and experience should exist at all levels of education. Education should mix general with vocationally or professionally oriented training whenever appropriate. Educational systems tend to separate education and training from the realities of earning a living or becoming part of this nation's productive work force. This issue involves questions of finance, public versus private education, the traditional role of the university, newer solutions versus older approaches and hundreds of biases that have been largely ignored by our society.

A fourth issue is whether the push for expanded career education is primarily a federal responsibility or a state responsibility. At a Department of Commerce Conference on youth career development, Secretary Elliot Richardson said that the private sector must "use its resources more extensively and effectively to stimulate increased career awareness, preparation and selection as well as the employment of American youth." He outlined a plan for business and industry to combat teenage unemployment and general unproductivity, and called on corporations to support career education. Further, he pointed to the importance of business and industry taking the initiative in outlining what is required for the development of educational policy if policies are to have an impact on education at all levels. He also advocated "bringing students and educators together into direct contact with work. Central to these remarks is the idea that youth cannot be expected to work or to learn to appreciate the importance of work as it relates to education unless employers are genuinely concerned with career opportunities, the value of work and honest productivity.

It is important to reassess work opportunities, laws relating to employment and work and certification requirements that relate directly to careers. The Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor and the Office of Education are cognizant of the importance of the participation both of federal agencies and the private sector in stimulating increased career awareness, preparation and employment of youth; but what about the participation of state and local governments? Education is the constitutional responsibility of the states. What is the relative impact that state, federal and private programs have on infusing curricula with principals of work and on resolving the artificial separation of education and work? It is a matter of sharing, of bringing the work ethic into a perspective that is acceptable and understandable to all who are concerned with the problem. Both current and pending federal legislation is designed to provide the impetus for a renewed effort to stimulate increased state and private sector participation in reaching a goal of common interest of both education and business at all levels -- the improvement of skills and their application to both careers and lifestyles.

Fifth, is career education worth the costs? Is career education expensive? Are present programs at state and local levels programatically effective or cost-effective? Can costs for effective career programs be translated into outcomes that are both desirable and defensible? Unlike other efforts at educational reform, career education as a concept does not lend itself to this type of analysis -- at least at the present time. One must remember that career education, as proposed, is not a separate program. It is not a new type of education. It is not distinct and separate from the liberal arts, from vocational education or from any other education process, new or old, that seeks to ensure that a rational and logical relationship between what one studies in a formal way can and what will be related to one's short- and long-term goals in life. Costs can only be related to specific programs that are carefully monitored and evaluated and that are studied in terms of carefully specified objectives and outcomes as related to educational practices.

One thing is sure. We will never know the value of career education at either state and local levels until we have attempted to relate programs to career education goals and have either failed or succeeded. In this regard, it appears that business and industry are at least as optimistic as education, and it is time to test a variety of approaches to accomplish our purposes. The real test of career education as a cost-effective approach to educational reform may well be in relating the collaborative efforts between businesses, industries and education to such factors as governance, employment factors, job satisfaction, dropout rates and other issues that perplex educators and affect the public's confidence in education.

Sixth, do collaborative efforts among leaders in business, industry, and education lead to external control of schooling? This is a loaded question and a complex issue, but one that is frequently asked. As support for career education develops and as increased stress is placed on the necessity for greater involvement of business, industry and labor in achieving the objectives of career education, there is the concomitant fear on the part of some educators that they are abdicating responsibilities for education to persons outside the professional education circle. From the beginning, career education has pointed to the necessity for close relationships between the communities of work and education. There are many different points of view involved related to this question. In general, those persons who are directly involved in career education assume that education is a political enterprise; that there are thousands of persons who can be legitimately involved in a political enterprise; and that there are thousands of persons who are not educators, including representatives of business and industry. It is impossible to conceive that the business and industry communities could become involved in total collaborative efforts with education in achieving the goals of career education without sharing in policy decisions and in implementation. Massive involvement of community representatives does indeed mean that all who participate are entitled to express their ideas and to influence the decision-making process. Career education does in fact propose wide community involvement. Leadership comes to those who seize the opportunity, and the opportunity is equally available to persons and groups inside and outside education and to those who are both directly and indirectly responsible for education.

Closely related to the above issues are six specific problem areas identified at the 1976 annual meeting of the Education Commission of the States. These hypothetical problem areas emerged from discussions involving leaders in business, industry, education and politics. They are representative of the concerns of decision makers who were sufficiently motivated to identify problems, address them in systematic ways and seek alternative solutions through deliberations in groups. Groups were composed of general educators, career education specialists, legislators, governors or their representatives, business persons and representatives from various educational and political organizations. Problems as stated for discussion were:

1. Society expects the schools to do the entire job of preparing people for the world of work. Despite the emphasis of career education on the importance of wide community involvement

in education decision making at both the policy making level and the implementation level, there continues to be a major segment of society that is willing to, or even insistent on, charging the schools with the major tasks of preparing persons for work.

2. There is little agreement as to what skills, attitudes and experiences best prepare persons for work and living. Unquestionably related to this problem is the persistent tendency for persons concerned with this problem to communicate only with others who have similar responsibilities, to perform identical tasks and in general to think alike (e.g., educators talk to educators, parents talk to parents and business people limit their interactions to discussions with other business persons). There are at least two additional considerations that relate to the disagreement as to what skills, attitudes and experiences prepare persons for employment and for life in general. First, schools have not developed mechanisms for involving parents, business persons, employers and other community members in educational decision making at the state and local levels. Second, there is inadequate information prepared for use by the community to interpret the relationship of acquired skills, attitudes and experiences to satisfaction and productivity in work and living.

3. Schools tend to emphasize either career learning or liberal arts rather than a blend or infusion of the two. Despite the continued insistence that career education is not a separate program or curriculum, there are those who insist that liberal arts, special education, vocational education, counseling and professional education are separate tracts and have little to do with each other. That all aspects of schooling at all levels is an integral part of career education is not yet fully accepted. It is more than an attitudinal problem. It is both a philosophical and practical issue that constitutes a potential barrier for strengthening collaborative efforts among education, business and industrial leadership.

4. There are limited opportunities for developing new skills and attitudes after one leaves the formal education system. Stated another way, there may be a number of opportunities for developing new skills and attitudes but there are also constraints or barriers to change, such as lack of awareness of opportunities that may exist or the failure of schools and external institutions to foster continuity between formal education in pre-occupational endeavors and continuing education.

5. Given the existing financial problems faced by our educational system, it appears unlikely that any system will be in a position to do much toward problems of preparing persons for work. While few persons would argue that our schools could do more to combine educational experiences with the world of work, it is clear that most educational institutions continue to face a financial crisis. Providing more money may or may not be the answer. A more efficient reallocation of economic resources may be at least as important if not more so. Further, career education as a concept calls for wider participation of the community in educational decision making at all levels and for "careers" to be considered a major objective of all educational experience. For many persons, the question of more money is not necessarily the central issue; more important, in the thinking of many is the need to restructure education at all levels to allow for the infusion of career education concepts in curriculum from preschool through postsecondary levels.

6. Our society has a tendency to launch efforts toward solving problems of careers and life preparedness before problems are carefully identified and defined. This problem is not limited to career education or, for that matter, to education in general. It is no doubt true that millions of persons historically have attempted solutions to problems without having had clear perceptions of the problems. Inadequate information, poor communications, negative attitudes and vested interests do indeed cloud the issues in all problem-solving processes.

PROBLEMS AND POSSIBILITIES OF INCREASED INTERACTION

Although many persons recognize the potential value of greater cooperation in the implementation of career education programs, they are cognizant of numerous problems and possible barriers in developing or strengthening business/education relationships. The identification and perception of barriers to improved business/education relations varies to a great extent with individual roles and responsibilities. What is perceived as a problem or barrier by an educator may not be considered significant by someone in business, and vice versa. Further, barriers to strengthened cooperation may vary from state to state or region to region depending on any number of economic, legal, geographic or demographic factors (e.g., the wealth or population characteristics of the state or community; state laws and local regulations; rural or urban factors; or even transportation considerations). It is nevertheless possible to identify a number of potential problems or barriers to increased cooperative efforts. Examples are:

- The participation of business and industry in state and local career education efforts is often not sought in the beginning. As perceived by leaders in business and industry, this is a serious problem. If business, and industry are important members of the career education team and are part of the education/political process (as are all other community groups), then they must participate in the formulation of a policy, the development of laws and the establishment of the legal bases for program. As viewed by many, it is unlikely that the business/industry communities can feel the same degree of commitment, reach consensus with educators and fully participate (as opposed to minimally cooperate) with schools in promoting career education if their support and participation is not invited through all phases of policy making until programs are ready to be implemented. This appears to be a key problem and one on which some career education advocates are divided. At any level, the implementation of career education is a long process involving the development of laws and regulations, the development of concensus among decision makers, the infusion of programs at all levels with career education concepts, the revision of laws and regulations, and the linking of federal programs with state and local programs.

Realistically, there are potential problems in the implementation process that must be addressed long before programs at the local level are ready to be implemented. Implementation involves a series of calculated and carefully analyzed steps. It does not occur instantaneously.

- Certification requirements and credentialing. This is a frequently mentioned and recognized barrier to improved relations among business, education and industry. While this problem is not limited to career education (e.g., reciprocity in certification is a major problem for states in all areas of elementary and secondary education), it has particular significance for career education. Many businesses and industries, for example, are willing to partcipate actively in preservice and inservice education of teachers in specially designed seminars for gifted and talented students, in counseling roles related to employment and placement, and in team teaching arrangements at all levels, elementary through postsecondary. It is not unusual to find that specialists in various areas (e.g., engineering, medicine, economics or personnel relations) are faced with enormous hurdles when they are loaned or placed on special assignment with the schools. It is particularly a problem at local levels where business and education have developed a mutual appreciation and understanding of the goals of career education and are ready to cooperate in an integrated program. Rigidly drawn standards with limited flexibility for accomodating exceptions has no doubt stopped many creative efforts. Despite continued interest in overcoming this barrier on the part of local districts, state education agencies, leaders in business and industry and a number of state, regional and national education and political organizations, the solution is still lacking.

- Personnel utilization education; in business and the identification of career prospects. Many writers have suggested that "too many young people are being educated and trained for prospects that subsequently turn out to be illusions." While it is true that much of the information currently available concerning employment prospects for graduates is not being utilized either inside or outside of education, it is also true that much information about career prospects is still not available, particularly as related to supply and demand for skilled and professional personnel. The Occupational Outlook Handbook published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics contains a great deal of information but probably not enough; in the opinion of the writer, it is inadequately and infrequently utilized. Almost anyone who has been associated with career education for any length of time can cite numerous instances where students are being prepared for occupations that no longer exist, where the requirements specified in the application for employment bears little relationship to the demands of the position, or where the demand for specialized personnel is so unevenly distributed throughout the nation that projections relative to the need or demand for workers is almost impossible to establish. Given the mobility of this nation's population, it is extremely difficult to initiate local and state programs that have direct implications for other parts of the country. Better information is needed concerning career prospects nationally if career education programs at the local level are to be successfully replicated elsewhere and if efforts to increase education/business/industry cooperation are to be broadened to a point where they have significance for interstate cooperation and for federal/state relations.

- Competencies perceived and required by business or industry for a working life are sometimes unclear to students, teachers and other members of the education community. The Office of Education's position statement on career education represents a challenge to all of society's institutions. The idea that career education "represents a response to a call for educational reform" is far reaching and implies that educational reform is not the only type of reform required. Social, economic and political reform is equally necessary. At the present time the goals and objectives of various societal institutions differ considerably: business and industry are profit oriented and cannot be otherwise, while education is unaccustomed to thinking in these terms and finds it difficult to relate dollars to proposed outcomes and objectives. Educators balk at the notion that their job should be limited to training potential workers to fit a mold prescribed by a multiplicity of community forces outside education, including business and industry. The cry for relevant education is deafening, but it is also confusing. Biases are rampant: the value system of parents; the demands of business, industry and labor; the expectations of the society at large -- all hold views that are conflicting, unrealistic and incompatible with what many educators feel they can deliver. Indeed, both business and education have a responsibility to define what they perceive to be essential competencies for a successful working life. Education, on the other hand, must make clear what it can deliver.

- Security, safety and insurance-related problems. A number of companies have pointed out that security considerations require that restrictions must be placed on visitations of outside persons. Some industries would have to develop elaborate security arrangements if students and teachers were to be brought into various plants on a regular basis. Further, some industries are particularly concerned about safety and should be. Work in many plants is dangerous and safety can be a serious problem for persons (especially children) unfamiliar with shop routines and practices. Some industries cannot safely conduct large tours or must limit visitations to secondary school age or older groups. Insurance problems constitute a real barrier. For example, a number of business and industry representatives have indicated that the field trip insurance of schools does not relieve the company from liability in the event of injuries to students. Also, insurance problems can occur when part-time student employees are injured.

- Continuity of communication between the schools and business or industry. Frequently mentioned by persons in business and industry is the importance of a continuing relationship between schools and business and industry. The changing roles and responsibilities inside both systems; including the promotion and reassignment of personnel and the continuous reorganization of administrative units, work against the continuity and contiguity that is essential if formalized and long-term relations between local districts and business are to be maintained.

- Time and money. Time and money are important considerations for both industry and education. Funding for career-related activities that involve the cooperation of business or industry cannot always be obtained by the schools. At the same time, many small businesses and companies willing to participate in proposed programs may not have financial resources that can be allocated. Time, which can easily be translated as money, can be even more important. Serving on educational advisory boards, participating in industry or school-sponsored seminars, supervising interns or conducting tours all require that considerable time be allocated by schools and industry. Both have been guilty of reserving allotted time and space for those activities most directly related to immediate payoffs.

- Inertia and the gap between the requirements of business or industry and the program objectives of schools. This problem as expressed by career education advocates in both education and industry has two dimensions. First, many key decision makers in education, business and industry remain unconvinced that career education linkages are important. In some instances there is the idea expressed that "our way" is the right way and "their way" is the wrong way. In short, there is significant resistance to institutional change. For example, academicians who do not view careers as a logical and desirable goal of education are not receptive to efforts outside the academic community to establish cooperative relations that involve the larger community. In much the same vein, leaders in industry or business whose involvement in education has been limited to programs involving their own personnel can be extremely resistant to a perceived invasion by educators. Second, school priorities, methods of instruction and

> training equipment do not necessarily complement the requirements of business or industry. Just as industry is not always willing to provide industrial teacher internships, information seminars and tours to keep school personnel abreast of new techniques and skill requirements, educators are sometimes unwilling to leave classrooms and administrative assignments to observe production procedures, to study expected performance factors or to view the latest in technology.

STRATEGIES FOR INCREASING THE PARTICIPATION OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY IN CAREER EDUCATION

Whether career education will maintain its momentum in the years ahead will depend to a great extent on the continued acceptance and increased participation in career education efforts at both policy and implementation levels by the larger community, including business and industry. The specific problem posed by this paper is how to increase the collaboration of education and business and industry in implementing career education. Many career education advocates would agree that education and the business/industry community are not well acquainted. Restoring the singleness of school and work is a major objective of the career education movement. It is a goal that is shared by many leaders in business, industry and education. After several years of efforts to increase the collaborative activities of business and education, the key questions remain. What can be done? Who should do what, and how?

As a beginning toward examining how career education concepts can be infused into education at all levels through the increased participation of business and industry, we must recognize that there are no pat answers that can be easily replicated in all situations. In some states and in some communities, collaborative efforts of education and industry have been going on for several years and many problems have been resolved. In other cases, major successes are not so apparent. Acting individually, local school districts, corporations and small businesses have initiated collaborative programs that have resulted in highly successful partnerships. In some cases the linking of school and work, the collaboration of industry and business and education, must be accomplished incrementally, a piece at a time, on a one-to-one basis.

The fact is, however, that many problems relating to such collaboration do not lend themselves to solutions by the response of a single district or business. In these instances the resources of multiple business or industries, multiple districts and numerous business and education organizations must be linked with the resources of state and federal education programs and government. A number of business and education organizations have initiated efforts to bring about broad-based, sustained collaborative efforts to address these problems that involve decision-making at both the policy level and implementation level. For example, the National Association of Manufacturers has supported the development of industry education councils to accomplish this objective. The councils are a mechanism for broadening the base of support for relevant schooling. The purpose is to bring all the educational resources within a community together to address issues involving the collaboration of industry and education. Basic to this concept is the idea that communications between industry and education can be significantly strengthened when there are means for coordinated action and when plans for action can be mutually agreed upon and addressed. Activities of the councils include instruction and curriculum development, career guidance, materials and services functions, and education and general management study and assessment.

The National Association of Manufacturers has also taken a strong position in support of the appointment of qualified individuals at the federal, state and local levels of government and education to coordinate and encourage formal cooperation between business and industry and education. In addition, this group has supported the use of community workshops to provide classroom teachers and others with opportunities to review the alternatives for using community resources in curriculum development and instruction. Emphasis is placed on utilizing the community as a learning laboratory and includes field trips and other involvement with various community institutions that can provide information and work in a variety of cooperative activities.

In another important effort, the National Association for Industry-Education Cooperation was created to mobilize the resources of industry to assist schools in developing programs relevant to the objectives and needs of industry. Emphasis is placed on improved communications between education and industry. The association supports the establishment of councils as an effective mechanism for linking education and industry; it also sponsors community resources workshops and has recently published a placement service training manual to assist state departments of education and local education agencies to develop job placement service programs.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has supported a variety of efforts to ensure increased education and business-industry cooperation. In 1973 this group sponsored a national conference on career education that resulted in a number of proposals by conference participants for strengthening cooperation in the implementation of career education. These proposals are worth repeating here:

- Exchange programs between business, labor, industry and school personnel. In general, this proposal urged that exchange programs be initiated whereby teachers, counselors and school administrators would spend time for pay outside educational institutions while members of the business, industry and labor would be invited to acquaint secondary-level and adult education students with their skills.

- Field trips for students. While the field trip is not new to education, this proposal was specifically aimed at increasing opportunities for students and teachers (kindergarten-12th grade) to spend time observing workers performing their jobs in various settings. As conceived, field trips for elementary, junior high and secondary level students would have different objectives and would be designed to appeal to the interests and needs of the students.

- Work experience for all high school students. This proposal would provide opportunities for all students to experience work, whether paid or unpaid. This proposal has had high acceptance in some states and communities, and a number of states have recently introduced or passed legislation that mandates that all secondary level students must participate in some type of work-study arrangement in order to graduate from high school.

- School-industry job placement programs. This proposal supports earlier ideas that aggressive job development and job placement activities should be undertaken by the schools in cooperation with business and industry. It stresses the importance of linking programs designed to motivate students to want to work with those mainly concerned with placement.

- Occupational resource persons from business, industry and labor. Emphasis in this proposal is on the development of lists of volunteer workers from all classes of occupations who will respond to personal contacts from students and teachers about their occupation.

- The year-round school, staffed in part by business/industry and labor personnel. The year-round-school concept has received considerable attention from educators at all levels over the past several years. National, regional and state associations have been organized to study and promote various concepts of year-round education. Many career education advocates see several versions of year-round education as essential for implementing career education programs. Although it is difficult to generalize about year-round education, most advocates tend to stress that school facilities might be open for as much as 16 hours daily, 12 months each year; that the personnel of business, labor and industry might be included as faculty in career education activities as part of their regular job assignments; that regular teachers and administrators might participate in industry on a staggered-time basis; and that students might graduate on a variable time schedule (e.g., each month during the year or on some other type of flexible basis).

- Using retired workers as resource persons in schools to acquaint students with the world of work. Several specialized areas of education (e.g., special education) and educationally related professions have in recent years stressed the viability of utilizing retired persons as an integral part of their education efforts. Career education programs are increasing the use of retired persons in numerous occupational areas to meet with students, teachers and administrators to communicate facts about their occupations as they relate to career choices and placement. The emphasis is on the importance of communications, work attitudes and job adjustments as well as the importance of skills development and the requirements of technology.

- Making work more personally satisfying to the individual. This concept is of central importance to career education. Inherent in this instance is the idea that work must be meaningful. The importance of autonomy and variety are stressed as important to the person. The difference between careers and jobs is also stressed.

- Every student leaving school should be equipped with a marketable skill. One of the products of increased collaboration between business, industry and education is the idea that all persons at their exit from school should possess marketable skills. In the face of high youth unemployment, dissatisfaction with the outcomes of education and the economic plight of public education, this concept has gained increasing attention from both educators and laymen.

- Every student leaving school should be able to find work. Career education emphasizes the importance of viewing work as a central component on one's life. This idea goes beyond wanting to work; it poses more an economic problem than an educational one.

If the participation of business and industry in the implementation of career education programs is to be significantly increased, there are major changes that must occur in both the education and business communities. First, improved legal bases for career education programs must be developed. At the present time, few states have developed policies or legislation to facilitate the infusion of career education concepts into the mainstream of education at all levels. As a preliminary step, attention must be given to determining the nature and extent of participation of business and industry in career education policy development and program implementation in each state. Specific attention must be given to ways to increase participation, at both state and local levels. Attention must also be given to identifying, classifying and reporting federal and state policies, laws and regulations that have implications for planning, financing and implementing career education, as well as, developing and recommending of alternative approaches to strengthening state education policies and legislation through the cooperative efforts of business, industry, labor, education and state government.

A second major change is that schools, business and industry must seek a consensus on the goals of education. Seeking consensus between two or more dimensions of the total community does not preclude the participation of other groups. In fact, a productive alliance between education and business will of necessity involve the participation of labor, parents and other formal and informal groups. It is clear that society at large does not in fact have well-formulated educational goals and it is probably too much to expect that education and industry can develop more than an operational consensus, at least in the beginning. The total community cannot be expected to agree on everything, but they can come to agreement on general aims and purposes. While the schools should probably take the lead in developing a working consensus after all, education is their business -- this does not rule out the possibility that members of the business and industrial community must take the initiative in setting the stage for preliminary conversation and decision making.

Third, attitudinal changes within and among educational institutions must occur. Schools at all levels must move from viewing themselves as educational institutions to a point where they can accept a role as social institutions. This broadened self-image portrays the essence of the career education concept, wherein career education is infused into, not added onto, the curriculum. Within this framework, career education supports the goals of all education at all levels. It is an approach firmly based in reality; it refutes the notion that academia is separate from the real world, that some courses of study are better than others or that continuity and contiguity between education and work is off the mark.

Fourth, organizational and structural changes must occur at all levels of formal education. It is in this context that the concept of the year-round schools has achieved the greatest attention. Numerous alternatives are possible, but it seems clear that institutional schedules will need to become more flexible. Graduation requirements must be reviewed and altered in many cases. Categorizing of students on the basis of test scores, goals and expectations must be bypassed in favor of broader career-oriented goals of students and institutions. Education must be personalized. After all is said and done, education is a human-service enterprise that is inextricably linked to the real world, the world that recognizes work as an integral part of living and surviving.

Fifth, stereotypes regarding work and working populations must be considered. In our culture as in others, certain types of work have been assigned greater prestige than others. No amount of verbal comment can change this fact. Some jobs are more prestigeous than others. In the minds of many persons, there are male and female jobs, lower class jobs and upper class positions, jobs for the smart and jobs for the not so smart. These views of one's relationship to work serve as profound barriers to the full implementation of the career education concept. Parents, employers, teachers and employees all contribute to this condition. These traditional stereotypes are subject to revision because equal educational opportunity does not occur where children or adults are not exposed to the full range of opportunities available to them.

Sixth, state and federal laws must be examined. Laws that prohibit or complicate the cooperation of business/industry and education must be reassessed. There are numerous federal and state laws, introduced and passed years before the advent of career education, that impede or prohibit industry - education cooperation. These laws must be studied and reevaluated in terms of current career education goals, the high levels of youth unemployment and a renewed effort on the part of education, industry and labor to cooperate in the implementation of career education.

Seventh, the role of the states in the implementation process must be stressed. Throughout this paper emphasis has been placed on the importance of strengthening political and education leadership within each state and between federal and state governments. The federal commitment to career education concepts is well known, but the states hold the key to the full implementation of these concepts. Federal support has been substantial and essential and will probably increase. However, when one considers the importance of state support for career education as compared to the commitment of the federal government, one can only conclude that the success or failure of career education at this point is in the hands of state leaders. State support and responsibility for education far exceeds that of the federal government; without it, no education movement, particularly one that emphasizes reform, can survive. States will need help, as will local districts; but it will be the state and local linkages with business and industry that will ensure the implementation of career education. Political and education linkages within each state and among states need to be strengthened. Alternative approaches to strengthening education-industry relations with consideration of the particular characteristics of each states need to be identified. Strategies for the development of a working partnership between the various levels of policy making in state government and business and industry should be studied, with the ultimate goal of combining resources.

Eighth, business and industry must be brought into the picture at an early stage. Just as labor demands equal participation with business and industry in the career education process, so it is or should be between business and education. No institution or segment of the community will stand for a minor role in this effort; none wants a role that begins after policies have already been determined.

Ninth, certification and credentialing requirements should be reevaluated. States must review certification and credentialing requirements, and reciprocity among states must be advocated. The career education movement may be the key to bringing about a solution to a problem that has perplexed those who have advocated regional and national cooperation among states for many years. These are not problems that lend themselves to solutions decreed from the top (federal) or bottom (local). Solutions to current problems related to certification and credentialing call for cooperation among states and the development of approaches that begin with efforts to increase interstate cooperation.

Tenth, better data on business/industry/education cooperation must be made available. At the present time there are hundreds of articles, monographs and reports that address numerous state and local issues related to industry/education cooperation. The writer identified more than 800 published documents since 1970 that deal with this topic. The discouraging fact is that this information is scattered and poorly catalogued. It is not tailored to the needs of specific consumers (e.g., college professors, legislators, state board members and leaders in industry all require different types of information). Many clearinghouses or brokerage units need to be established, and information must be specifically tailored to the consumers and not limited to the needs of educators.

Eleventh, the importance of the business/industry/education linkage must be publicized. The number-one problem in implementing mandated education legislation at the state level has to do with interpreting the outcomes and potentialities of the mandates to the community. As an example, the costs, consequences and benefits of state laws relating to equal education opportunity for the handicapped, passed by many states in the early 1970's, were not systematically interpreted to the public until the implementation process was under way. This delay resulted in confusion and misunderstanding in many communities that would ultimately benefit from the legislation. It may be trite to say that better communication is needed, but the truth is that bad publicity or the lack of any publicity has already slowed the efforts of career education implementation.

There are charges that it is too expensive, that it is an effort to do away with basics in education, that it is simply "progressive education" or that it is only a new name for vocational education. If community cooperation is essential for the success of career education, then it is imperative that career education advocates interpret their goals to the public.

In the history of American education there has never been an effort at reform that has taken the course of career education. Past efforts at reform have invariably originated with a particular school of thought or philosophy and proceeded through a predictable sequence of activities calculated to sell the new ideas to anyone who would listen. Some efforts, the more sophisticated ones, relied on established names or philosophies in education for support and planned their strategies to influence key persons in the education community. Career education is truly different. It is tied to no single discipline. It has no national organization to serve as an advocacy group. It cuts across all levels of education and is dependent on the support of laymen as well as educators for its success. It is heartening but no less amazing that the Commissioners Conference on Career Education, recently held in Houston, Texas, could draw the active participation of almost 9,000 persons who represented the most diverse interests imaginable (e.g., classroom teachers, administrators, legislators, business executives, parent groups, labor organizations and the press). However, while this may be a grassroots phenomenon, it cannot survive without the leadership of all interests who have reason to be interested in the concept. Consensus among decision makers is the key, and representatives of business, industry and education are central participants in the process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Telephone and Telegraph Co., New York, N.Y.; Institute for Educational Development, Bridging the Gap, An Independent Case Study; New York, N.Y., May 1970, 67p

Banta, Trudy W.; Marshall, Patricia; Bringing Schools and Industry Together; Manpower; June 1970; 2; 6; 24-41

Banta, Trudy, W.; and Others, Work Education: A Topical Bibliography of Programs, Procedures and Research, Sponsored by Office of Education (DHEW), Office of Planning Budgeting and Evaluation, No. OEC-0-72-5024, Washington, D.C., 1973, 136p

Banta, Trudy W.: Towne, Douglas C., Sponsoring Agency: Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C., Tenn Univ., Knoxville College of Education, Interpretive Study of Cooperative Efforts of Private Industry and the Schools to Provide Job-Oriented Education Programs for the Disadvantaged., No. BR-8-0610, OEG-0-8-08-0610-4489, April 1969, 263p

Bell, T.H., The New World of Education and Work, Prepared for Meeting of The Houston Chamber of Commerce and Education Officials of the State of Texas, Nov. 1974, 14p

Benedict, Gil; Skills and Knowledge on Display: An Automotive Trouble Shooting Contest; Technical Education News; January-February 1974; 33; 1; 14

Branscomb, Lewis M; Gilmore, Paul C.; Education in Private Industry Daedalus; W 75; 104; 1; 222-233

Brison, David W.; Out-of-School Education in the Social Service Sector; Phi Delta Kappan; December 1973; 55; 4; 237-239.

Brookover, Wilbur B.; Nosow, Sigmund, A Sociological Analysis of Vocational Education in the United States, Michigan State Univ., East Lansing., Sponsoring Agency: Dept. of HEW, Washington, D.C., 33p

Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education DHEW/OE ; Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, The Business/Labor/Education Professional Devleopment Partnership: A Workshop to Assure Implementation of the Cooperative Teacher Training Concept in Selected States, Washington, D.C., Denver, Colorado., June 1974, 94p

Burt, Samuel M.; You May Not Agree, But. . . Education and Industry Can Make a Great Team; Todays Education; December 1, 1970; 59; 9; 34-6

Burt, Samuel M.: Striner, Herbert E., Toward Greater Industry and Government Involvement in Manpower Development. Staff Paper., Upjohn (W.E.) Inst. for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan, September 1968, 26p

Carlson, Elliott; Education and Industry: Troubled Partnership; Saturday Review; August 15, 1970; 53; 33; 45-7, 58-60

Chemical and Engineering News; Stronger Academia-Industry Ties Urged; February 75; 53; 8

Church, Olive; Teaming and Scheming for Career Education; American

Vocational Journal; February 75; 50; 2; 86-8; 91

Confederation of British Industry.; Schools Council, London (England).; Scottish Education Dept., Edinburgh, Closer Links Between Teachers and Industry and Commerce, No. WP-7, 1966, 31p

Connors, John F.; Industry and Vocational Education -- Partners; Training and Development Journal; March 1972; 26; 3; 16-22

Cook, Jerry L.; Can Voc-ed Find Happiness with Industry? School Shop; April 1975; 34; 8; 68-9

Culbertson, Jack, "The Way it Could Be." Paper presented to EDPA Directors of Programs in Educ. Admin. (Miami, Florida, March 21, 1969)

Daniel,Yankelovich, The Changing Values on Campus (New York: Washington Square Press, 1972), p.40

Decarlo, Charles R.; Robinson, Ormsbee W., Education in Business and Industry., Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1966

Education Commission of the States; Synthesizing Work and Schooling: The Role of Community and Society, No. 91, Denver, Colorado, September 1976, 21p

Ensigh, M. Dale; Industry-Education Cooperation; Business Education Forum; October 1972; 27; 1; 10, 12-13

Gamage, C.S.; An Example of Cooperation Between Industry and Schools; School Science Review; June 1974; 55; 193; 674-682

General Electric Co., Corporate Educational Relations Operation, Educators-in-Industry; Career Guidance Programs Handbook, No. ER-100 (IM)-10/74, 29p

Grabiner, Gene; Corporate Involvement in Elementary and Secondary Schools; New School of Education Journal; Spring 1971; 2; 2; 46-66

Greater Newark Chamber of Commerce, N.J., Career Education in Newark; A Report of the Survey of Career Education in the City of Newark, New Jersey. Vol. I., June 1973, 115p

Hooten, David E., Ed., Proceedings of the Patterns Seminar, Rochester Inst. of Tech., N.Y., May 1975, 35p

Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Dayton, Ohio.: Johnson Foundation, Inc., Racine, Wisc.: Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, Detroit, Mich., Citizens, Businessmen, and Educators: The Elements to Better School-Community Relations. An Occasional Paper., 1972, 26p

Institute for Educational Development, Industry and Education, Study No. 2/Partnerships: "Partnership" High Schools: The Search for New Ways to Cooperate ., New York, N.Y., October 1969, 63p

Jacob,W. Getzels, "On the Transformation of Values: A Decade after Port Huron," School Review 80 (August 1972): 505-19

James, A. Davis, Great Aspirations (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.,1964)

Johnson, Beverly B.; Conversations with Business and Industry; American Vocational Journal; May 1971; 46; 5; 59-61

Kreuter, Mortimer; Barnett, Lawrence J., Curriculum Relevancy and Work, Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y., March 1967, 20p

Lee, Ivy, Jr.; Industry-Education: One Community; Man/Society/Technology; A Journal of Industrial Arts Education; September-October 1972; 32; 1; 73-79

Lynn, David R.; Nothom, John W.. Educational Activities within Business-Industry: Implications for Public Education, Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. Community Coll. System, January 1968, 62p

Mallas, Aris A.: and Others, Strategies for Career Education in Rural Texas and the Relationship of Education to Industrial Development Cycles, Education Service Center Region 14, Abilene, Texas, December 1973, 90p

Martin, Gordon E.; Closing the Communications Gap Between Industry and Education; Man/Society/Technology; December 75; 35; 3; 73-5

McPherson, William H.; Teaching Teachers about Industry; Man/Society/ Technology; September/October 1975; 35; 1; 12-3; 25

Meyer, Mary Coeli; Combining Resources for Survival: A Look at Two Institutions; Personnel Journal; December 1975; 54; 12; 628-30

Miller, Joseph A.; Career Education Field Trips Man/Society/Technology; January 1975; 34; 4; 118-19

Mumford, Donald, Ed., Career Education: Suggested School-Industry Programs, Warren City Schools, Ohio, 1975, 30p

National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Career Education Program: FY 1974: Final Evaluation Report: Volume 1,Washington, D.C., Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, PA., September 1974, 143p

National Association of Manufacturers, Community Resources Workshops: A First Step Toward Better Industry-Education Cooperation, New York, N.Y. Education Committee, 1970, 21p

Office of Education (DHEW), EPDA--Industry/Exchange Program: Final Report, Washington , D.C., 1974, 94p

Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, Papers Presented at the National Conference on Vocational Education of Handicapped Persons (Pittsburgh, Pa.. Feb. 25-27, 1969); Summary of Conference Work Groups. Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. Program of Special Education and Rehabilitation, February 1969, 77p

Price, Charlton R.: and Others, American Business and School-Based Career Education, National Inst. of Education (DHEW), No. VT-102-476, Washington, D.C., 1975, 87p

Prince George's County Board of Education, Career Development: A Community Approach in the Prince George's County Public School, Upper Marlboro, Md., September 1973, 28p

Prince George's County Board of Education, Career Education and the Business Community: A Joint Effort., Upper Marlboro, Md., Prince George's County Chamber of Commerce, Greenbelt, Md., 1975, 27p

Prince George's County Board of Education, Community Resources: A Partnership in Career Education, Upper Marlboro, Md., 1975, 102p

Ricci, Fred A.; Enlist Industry Participation in Cooperative Programs; Business Education Forum; April 1976; 30; 7; 9-10

Rinaldo, Donna J.; and Others; Education Teams with Industry; Childhood Education; January 1974; 50; 3; 139-142

Ressler, Ralph; How to Break Down the Wall Between School and Work; Industrial Education; February 1974; 63; 2; 36-7

Robert A. Sampieri, Educational Linkage-Suggested Rules & Techniques or The Synaptic Aspects of a Partnership Plus Other Common Trivia; The Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, March 1975, 7p

Ryan, Charles W.; Career Development: Cooperation is Catching On; American Vocational Journal, November 1973; 48; 8; 36-38

Thompson, Franklin J.; Developing Program Around Out-of-School Experiences; NASSP Bulletin, May 1974; 58; 382; 171-6

Vander Kamp, Abigail A., Office of Edu-ation (DHEW), Career Education Provided by Business and Industry in the Milwaukee Area. Final Report., Washington, D.C., June 1972, 40p

U.S. Dept. of Labor, Youth and the Meaning of Work, Manpower Research Monograph No. 32, based on a report by David Gottlieb (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), p28

Waldo, Charles N.,Closing the Classroom/Business World Relevancy Gap Journal of Business Education; November 1974; 50; 2; 86

Wientge, King M., Workshop for Counselors and Educators Concerned with the Education, Training, and Employment of Minority Youth. Final Report, Part I, Development, Program Evaluation. University College Research Publication, No. 7., Metropolitan Saint Louis Plans for Progress Companies, Mo.; Washington Univ., St. Louis, Mo., October 1965, 81p

Wray, Ralph D.; A Dichotomy: Cooperative Education and Work Experience; Balance Sheet; December 75/January 76; 57; 4; 170-1; 183

Williamsen, Jean, Work Education, Prima County Developmental Career Guidance Project, Tucson, Ariz. 18p

Youth, Robert J. Havighurst and Philip H. Dreyer, Editors, The Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1, 1975, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois

ISSUES AND STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING THE PARTICIPATION OF LABOR IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION

Mark Schulman
Antioch College

ISSUES AND STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING THE PARTICIPATION OF LABOR IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION

By

Mark Schulman

PREFACE

This short paper, I will admit at the outset, raises many more questions than it can resolve.

The research which it represents was undertaken to suggest potential solutions to the problems implicit in the following statement of the "Scope of Work":

> 1. *Contact major organized labor sources to assess the problems and possibilities of interrelationships between unions and schools in implementing the concept of career education.*
>
> 2. *Review the literature (both statements by unions and articles by educators) on the participation of labor in the implementation of career education.*
>
> 3. *Organize and write a paper which considers the following issues:*
>   - a. *The effect of images of work in the school and curriculum and in other educational sources on young people's perceptions of unions and their own careers.*
>   - b. *The conflicts and compatibilities in the current concept of career education and organized labor's viewpoints.*
>   - c. *The pros and cons of work experience, considering the potential of various forms of paid and unpaid work experience and the question of the relationship between student workers and unemployment.*

d. The viewpoints of education and labor leaders of the transition between education and work and how the concept of career education relates to that area.

4. Write a summary as part of the paper which identifies and recommends strategies for enhancing the participation of labor in the implementation of career education.

Though I am not apologetic for the results I have managed under the usual constraints all researchers cite (time, money and people-power), I must now agree with one of my correspondents, who wrote:

> First of all, in reviewing the "Scope of Work" statement you sent, I am in awe at the size of the topic you are to address. Any one of the issues would have been sufficient for a paper. Good luck to you.

Yes, any one issue would have been sufficient, but yes, too, I have had good luck-- in being able to contact approachable and thoughtful people in the labor movement and among educators who have been invaluable in their aid. While acknowledging their factual and critical assistance, it must be made clear that the interpretive and evaluative analysis of this material is my own. Therefore, any errors-- and, given the size of the topic, there are undoubtedly some-- are entirely my own.

The procedure followed in the development of this paper corresponded to the outline suggested in the Statement of Work.

In July and August, 1976, I made contact with as many labor unions and other labor organizations as possible. Of approximately one hundred unions I approached, more than 25% have responded with specific information by this date-- and material continues to arrive.

During August and September, 1976, I followed up on initial contacts with individuals in the labor movement and searched the recent literature of career education for relevant portions. In addition, I established contact with several educators to take advantage of their conceptual expertise and knowledge of specific developments.

By the first week of October, 1976, a draft of this paper was circulated to a selected list of correspondents. Their comments and suggestions are incorporated in the final version submitted to the National Advisory Council on Career Education.

I do not desire to slight any of the people who have been helpful to me in this project by omitting their names from an attempt at a comprehensive list. I must, however, cite several sources without whom this paper would not have been possible--though I am making no attempt at comprehensiveness. Among those sources are Kenneth R. Edwards, Al Lorente, Calvin M. McIntyre, Horst Reschke, John A. Sessions, Gus Tyler, William E. Weisgerber.

Even in its "finished" draft, this remains little more than an annotated outline on this topic. It provides, I hope, directions and insights which may be followed up by others and in my own subsequent research. If, by raising questions and pointing toward tentative solutions, I am able to encourage further probing, then I have been successful.

--Mark Schulman
Yellow Springs, Ohio
October 27, 1976

ISSUES AND STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING THE PARTICIPATION OF LABOR IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE..................Page ii

INTRODUCTION.............Page 1

PART 1: ISSUES (Pages 6 - 40)

Theoretical Considerations...................Page 6

Conceptual Considerations....................Page 20

Operational Considerations...................Page 30

PART II: STRATEGIES (Pages 41 - 57)

Short-Range Implementation...................Page 44

Long-Range Implications......................Page 53

PART II: CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY (pages 58 - 64)

Some Tentative Conclusions...................Page 58

An Action-Oriented Summary...................Page 62

NOTES....................Page 65
APPENDIX.................Page 71

INTRODUCTION

As an overview to the subject of this paper, we need to keep in mind an explanatory caution, a fundamental issue, and a primary question.

A CAUTION

First, the caution:

The title of this paper implies that we are discussing "labor" and "career education". This is in actuality only partially correct.

Given the reality of locating and querying spokespersons for those spheres of endeavor, the inclination is to seek out the people and organizations which have been most articulate on the issues. In the case of "labor," this proves to be the trade union movement, and, more particularly, certain entities within that movement (e.g., the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations-- AFL-CIO-- and the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America-- UAW).

In the case of career education, the most prominent informational source is (and has been since the establishment of the Office of Career Education, if not before) the United States Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (OE). Specifically certain individuals associated (now or in the past) with OE-- such as Sidney P. Marland, Jr. and Kenneth B. Hoyt-- have been among the movement's most prominent spokespersons.

The caveat, of course, is to keep in mind that unions do not speak for all workers and that OE does not speak for all educators. Basic statistics indicate the reality of the situation. In recent years only about one-fourth of the labor force has belonged to unions; unorganized workers by the nature of their circumstance have little input to the career education discussion. And there are thousands of separate and, to one degree or another, autonomous school districts in the United States, each modifying to local conditions their interpretations of career education concepts.

It is true, however, that organized labor's self-construed primary role is to articulate the needs of people-as-workers. This does not exclude, of course, their other roles, but it is most important to note that, in the absence of any other association of people-as-workers within the social framework, organized labor is the only recognizable entity to speak for that group as a collectivity. Indeed, this should not be read to imply a negative stance toward trade unions as they perform this function; in most instances, they do this job well (perhaps too well, according to their critics).

With OE there is even firmer ground for accepting its role as articulator of the career education concept even if other conceptual frameworks are available.[1] For the five years this approach to educational reform has been undergoing clarification, OE and its leadership have taken the commendable ideological position that, for reform to truly "take hold," it cannot be imposed from above. This stance has led to a surprising degree of consensus among career educators on definitional aspects of the concept, demonstrated primarily in the OE policy paper, An Introduction to Career Education, to which we will often refer.

THE ISSUE

Delving into the realm of ideology brings us face to face with the fundamental issue mentioned previously. Fundamental to any discussion is the issue of the relationship of school and society. What must ultimately be determined is the nature of the society itself, which in turn defines the nature of the schools which serve its needs.

It is clearly beyond the scope of this paper to address this issue in any but the most peripheral manner. And since there will be some further discussion appropos the topic (particularly in the conclusion), we will leave it at this point-- except for one addition.

Career educators preach reform of the educational system and quote with approbation the contemporary critics of the formal educational process-- Holt, Kozol, Silberman, et al; even Illich in some cases. In their approach they value a totally transformed school and depend upon the cooperation-- even more than that, the collaboration-- of all the diverse elements in the society to work toward the common goal, defined as career education for all.

But trade unionists are ideologically divergent from this goal in at least one important respect: their realization that conflict, not consensus, is the reality beneath the interaction between labor and management on several important specific issues (such as wage policies and workplace priorities). As will be discussed later, this recognition has specific consequences in the implementation of career education. At this point it is sufficient to note the general consequence only: a mutual suspicion between labor leaders and educators of the reality behind each other's rhetoric. One possible cause for this attitude that goes beyond rhetoric is the actual roles of the parties involved. As worker's representatives, union leaders share a labor perspective. But since many career education spokespersons are administrators in their school systems, they often agree with management assumptions.

This situation appears to be changing through an ongoing process of evolution and development and at present many educator/labor leader differences are being resolved. It is important not to disregard this area as a real and potential clash of ideologies and interests, nevertheless.

A QUESTION

This issue indicates what must be stated as the primary question of this research. It is implicit, in fact, in all educational research.

Stated simply, it is this: to achieve the humanistic goals proposed by the proponents of career education, how adequate is the educational reform they suggest? To put it another way: granted that the comprehensive transformation of the schools (advocated in the career education concept) is not proposed as the only element in profound social change, nevertheless how close or how far is it from the mark? After career education, what happens next? Or, in reality, will conditions remain basically the same? We will return to this question in the conclusion.

ORGANIZATION OF PAPER

The sections which follow approach the relationship between career education and labor in two distinct ways. The first is the issues behind the relationship. Each of the three subdivisions of this section deals with a level of appropriate considerations: first the theoretical, then the conceptual, and last the operational.

Following the issue considerations are two sections on strategies to consolidate and/or modify the "action plan" of labor participation in career education. The first subdivision treats the subject of the short-range implementation suggestions; the second, the topic of long-range implications.

In the concluding section, the issues and strategies are pulled together in an assessment of the future prospects of career education, in relation to past realities and present possibilities.

One additional note on organization: the reader may peruse the first half of this paper with an increasing level of pessimism and negative feelings about the possibility of constructive interrelationships between career education and organized labor. This would be a fallacious perception for at least two reasons.

First, the paper attempts through its documentation to supply a sense of the evolution of the issues over a fixed time period. Thus, while it is not a strict chronological order, the quotations tend to stress more antagonistic relations and less coherent and developed formulations (by both labor leaders and educators) in the "early years." Since "early years" quotations predominate in the first sections, there is a somewhat misleading skew toward antipathy.

Secondly, and more importantly, the attitudes and conceptual framework is changing very rapidly. Literally in the last few months (and even weeks and days) new developments and outlooks have been increasing the degree of common interest between labor and career education. As with any project which attempts to chronicle a dynamic process, the setting down on static pages of the description renders the analysis obsolete before its time.

The careful reader, then, must suspend judgement until the end of these pages-- and, even then, must temper any conclusions-- this paper's or his/her own-- with the fresh evidence of fast-moving events.

PART I - ISSUES

Theoretical Considerations

As in no other period of human history, we are living in a world of rapid change. The knowledge and skills that we acquired in schools are obsolete today for our children, and they must be updated to be useful in our own lives. Advanced technology has revolutionized all aspects of modern society. Some of the most extensive changes have been in the world of work and in the changing patterns of our lives.

We have been told frequently that a young person entering the world of work today must face the possibility of changing occupations and jobs several times in his life, because the career for which he has prepared himself has become obsolete. This has immediate implications for education.

This would seem to dictate that an education system that trains students narrowly for specific jobs will fail in its purpose. The development of specific technical skills is not the fundamental purpose of education. In today's world, when skills are becoming so rapidly outmoded, the acquisition of such skills is even less meaningful.

Education embraces, but is much more than job-training. Education must prepare students to become constructive human beings, teach them how to become intelligent consumers, teach them how society operates and how to participate intelligently in its operation. It must teach them how to adapt to change so as to enrich the quality of their lives. It must teach them how to learn.

Vocational education has been looked on as the way society separates those who are college-bound from those whose fate it is to wind up in the factories. What is learned in these programs bears too little relationship to the world of work as a whole, nor does it prepare the students to function productively in a society in the broader sense of full participation as a citizen.

The latest catch word on the education scene is "career education." It is not clear as yet whether the concept of career education will be a passing fad in a long list of educational panaceas. If it is not to wind up on the scrap heap of discarded ideas, it should relate career alternatives to the ongoing changes in our society and offer the student realistic options.

> *Moreover, how realistic are career options with an administration in Washington willing to consider our economy operating at full employment when over five per cent of our workforce (10 per cent in Michigan) is unemployed? It seems clear that career options and career education can only become meaningful when there are jobs available for everyone seeking work.*
>
> *If career education is viewed as a means of restoring the so-called "work ethic," this attempt, too, will not succeed. There is no "dignity of labor" where the work is on dead-end, dull, repetitive, meaningless jobs. Workers need no catch phrases to understand how to bring dignity to the work place. They do so when they join unions so they can participate in decision making affecting their welfare at the work place.*
>
> *--From the "Resolution on Public Education" adopted at the UAW 24th Constitutional Convention, 1974.*[2]

At the most abstract theoretical level, unions and educators must reach agreement (or at least agree to disagree) before organized labor will accept a substantive role in the implementation of career education. Even before discussing the definitions of such words as "work" and "education" as concepts, we must have tentative agreement about a theoretical basis for relating education and the world of work.

Theories of work and labor are many, as are theories of education and learning. This section briefly outlines a theory of work common to both career education and labor, comments on the educational aspects of social institutions other than the school, and raises some questions regarding the "extensive changes...in the world of work and in the changing patterns of our lives."

After outlining the historical development of work-- through Luther, Freud, Marx, and so on-- the HEW task force which produced the monumental study Work in America correctly asserts that "work responds to something profound and basic in human nature." [3] They then proceed to offer a "multi-dimensional definition" of work: "an activity that produces something of value for other people."[4] Such a definition is expanded on by the OE definition discussed later. But we cite it here because of the explicit theoretical assumption behind the definition: that in its broadest sense work *qua* work is valuable for the individual.

A
THEORY
OF
WORK

This is, in fact, a *hypothesis* concerning the nature of work rather than a scientific fact. In the reality of their lives many workers seem to find the notion that their activity called "work" is valuable a mockery of their own perceptions. They know, in their bones, what Studs Terkel alleges in *Working*:

> This book, being about work, is, by its very nature, about violence-- to the spirit as well as to the body. It is about ulcers as well as accidents, about shouting matches as well as fistfights, about nervous breakdowns as well as kicking the dog around. It is, above all (or beneath all), about daily humiliations. To survive the day is triumph for the walking wounded among the great many of us.[5]

If the direct evidence of most people's lives contradicts the theoretical assertions of a conceptualizer, either a) "most people" are confused about their lives, or b) the conceptualizer doesn't know what he or she is talking about. In relation to a theory of work, we arrive at our first complication: career education proponents opt for explanation "a," while labor leaders often choose explanation "b."

Hoyt, for example, has written and lectured many times about this question.[6] His point-of-view is that the dull and meaningless activity most people call "work" should actually be called "labor," and differentiated from the meaningful, satisfying, and productive activity that is "work."[7] Disregarding for the moment the unfortunate consequences of redefining labor in a way certain to alienate labor leaders, the progression from this point-of-view to the conceptual framework of career education is logical and positive.

But what if the educators are wrong? What if, instead, John A. Sessions has come closer to the reality of the matter, as when he argues in a March, 1974, AFL-CIO American Federationist article "Misdirecting Career Education:"

> ...Writing about career education and the world of work from the outside looking in has its advantages and its disadvantages. The book [OE 's Essays in Career Education] says much about what career education can do to restore "the work ethic" and the "dignity of labor." This is an outsiders misunderstanding about what work is all about. Most workers do not work because they think it is the ethical thing to do but because their families will go hungry if they don't...
>
> Workers are fully aware that their jobs frequently involve indignities and that is why they form unions. If there is dignity in labor, it is usually not a natural state of affairs but rather the result of unions through which workers have brought a measure of dignity to their jobs.[8]

Sessions, an assistant director in the AFL-CIO education department, speaks for many in organized labor. Labor consistently questions whether educators understand what they are talking about when they describe work. The dispute goes beyond amiable definitional discussion; it is, in fact, in the realm of serious philosophical argumentation.

EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL THEORY

Labor organizations have raised questions, too, about the educational theory which informs the career education perspective. Most of these questions have been raised before and cannot be called "resolved." They for the most part fall into the "general categories of disagreement" Marland elucidates in Career Education: A Proposal for Reform:

1. Career education is anti-intellectual.
2. The concept is too fuzzy and ill-defined.
3. Blacks and other minorities are threatened by what might be called "tracking."
4. Young children are not ready to "decide" about their careers.
5. Career education's solely concerned with getting jobs and filling manpower needs in a capitalist system.
6. The colleges and universities are already threatened with a lowering or a leveling-off of enrollments-- career education may aggravate the problem.
7. Career education programs are "taking money away" from vocational education programs.
8. The unpredictability of the manpower needs of this country makes career education a "futile exercise."
9. Career education is a device for perpetuating a "corporate social order," reinforcing big business and productivity, as distinct from values related to human services.
10. The concept appears to perpetuate the stereotyping of occupations by sex, and gives insufficient attention to women in occupations.[9]

Many of these disagreements will surface in subsequent pages as we look at conceptual and operational considerations.

Most of them relate to the educational theory of formal schooling.

The labor movement does not, in general, believe that career education has provided satisfactory answers.

But we must move away from the institution of the formal school to consider another, less acknowledged, aspect of the educational theory problem. OE has recognized that education takes place outside the school both in their conceptual definitions and their career education models.[10] When one looks at the reality of these other forms of education, other problems emerge in relating learning and the world of work.

Though they clearly fit our definition, we will not consider here the family-home, or the church, or community institutions, as educational agencies which may effect learning about careers. But we must consider in brief one educator, for we would commit grave errors of interpretation if we were to ignore it. We refer, of course, to the mass media, particularly television.

Research has demonstrated the importance of the media in the education of youth.[11] While it is true that little is known conclusively about the effects of media on people, we do know that, statistically at least, the influence must be overwhelming: the percentage of homes with TV sets nears 100%; young people have spent more hours in front of television than in school by age 18; each person averages six hours a day watching television; and so on.

Consequently, the image of work, workers and unions becomes a theoretical concern for career educators. Little research is available in this area; what exists demonstrates how media distort occupational information.

Work in America, for example, discusses "Society's View of the Manual Worker":

> We must also recognize that manual work has become increasingly denigrated by the upper middle class of this nation. The problems of self-esteem inherent in these changing attitudes are further compounded by the impact of the communications media. For example, the images of blue-collar workers that are presented by the media (including school textbooks) are often negative. Workers are presented as "hard hats" (racists or authoritarians) or as "fat cats" (lazy plumbers who work only twenty-hours a week yet earn $400.00). The view of the worker in the mass media is that he is the problem, not that he has problems.
>
> Today there is virtually no accurate dramatic representation-- as there was in the 1930's-- of men and women in working-class occupations. Instead, we have recently had the movie "Joe" and the television series about Archie Bunker ("All in the Family"). These stereotypes-- ignoring the heterogeneity of blue-collar workers-- do little to enhance the dignity of the worker or his job. For example, what does Archie do on the job? Is he ashamed of his job? Is that why he won't talk about it at home? Certainly, if he worked in an office we would see scenes of him at work. The negative view of all blue-collar work in the show is reinforced by the fact that Archie's "socially enlightened" son-in-law is a future professional.
>
> Research shows that less than one character in ten on television is a blue-collar worker, and these few are usually portrayed as crude people with undesirable social traits. Furthermore, portrayals tend to emphasize class stereotypes: Lawyers are clever while construction workers are louts. But it is not only the self-image of the workers that is being affected; television is conveying to children superficial and misleading information about work in society. If children do, indeed, learn from television they will "learn" that professionals lead lives of carefree leisure, interspersed with drama and excitement (never hard work) and that blue-collar workers are racist clods who use bad grammar and produce little of use for society.[12]

Parenthetically, it is a useful categorization these authors make to include "school textbooks" among the means of mass communication. Indeed, dealing with textbooks raises additional questions regarding images of labor and labor history. Paul Lauter and Florence Howe cite one example in The Conspiracy of the Young:

> At the same time, textbooks ignore or distort class conflicts in American society. A friend born and raised on the West Coast told us that when he first visited Chicago he was eager to see Haymarket Square, because it had been prominent in the city's early labor struggles about which he had read in a novel. He asked his host, a high-school aged cousin from a working-class family, if he could show him how to get to the Square. The response was, "What do you want to go there for? There's nothing but some restaurants and old stores." The cousin had never read in his Chicago school texts of the Haymarket trial, the McCormick strike, the Knights of Labor, nor of Governor Altgeld. Which is not surprising: the 1962 edition of The Story of the American Nation devotes four paragraphs to the DEW (Distant Early Warning) Line but never mentions Eugene Debs or Norman Thomas, let alone A.J. Muste. Another text mentions the 1937 sit-down strikes, but tells neither their location nor their connection with the automobile industry. Just as black people have, on the whole, been deprived of their past, so young working class men and women have no conceptions even of those events of the last hundred years that have helped determine how they lived, and where.[13]

There are additional misrepresentations that afflict every medium and go beyond labor's image and encourage inequality in career choice. Blacks and other minorities have been victimized by institutional racism in this area as in others; women are victims of sexist socialization. Tentative evidence does not indicate that career education is correcting these flaws-- see, for example, "Help Wanted: Sexism in Career Education Materials," produced by Women on Words and Images.[14]

The world, then, of the media is not a world that corresponds to reality. George Gerbner and Larry Gross sketch the occupational aspects of that world in the realm of television drama in their article "Living With Television: The Violence Profile" (Journal of Communication, Spring, 1976):

> Approximately five in ten characters can be unambiguously identified as gainfully employed. Of these, three are proprietors, managers, and professionals, the fourth comes from the ranks of labor-- including all those employed in factories, farms, offices, shops, stores, mining, transportation, service stations, restaurants, and households, and working in unskilled, skilled, clerical, sales, and domestic service capacities. The fifth serves to enforce the law or preserve the peace on behalf of public or private clients.
>
> Types of activities-- paid and unpaid-- also reflect dramatic and social purposes. Six in ten characters are engaged in discernible occupational activity and can be roughly divided into three groups of two each. The first group represents the world of legitimate private business, industry, agriculture, finance, etc. The second group is engaged in activity related to art, science, religion, health, education, and welfare, as professionals, amateurs, patients, students, or clients. The third makes up the forces of official or semi-official authority and the army of criminals, outlaws, spies, and other enemies arrayed against them. One in every four leading characters acts out a drama of some sort of transgression and its suppression at home and abroad.[15]

This is, obviously, a gross distortion of the occupational structure of the United States in the mid-70's. Note, for example-- both in the research and anecdotal evidence-- the lack of union members on television. Where is the one in four workers who are organized? When unions are represented, it is usually a negative portrayal-- the recent popular example is Tom Hartman's battle with corrupt union officials in Mary Hartman, Mary Hartman. Such distortions have not gone unnoticed by labor. As one president of an international union wrote to the author recently,

> The University faculty members [and, by extension, all educators] having had no instruction in this extremely significant aspect of American life, do not understand the fundamental aspects of the labor movement. They tend to reflect the prejudices and misconceptions acquired by reading the capitalistic-dominated press and listening to the management-oriented television newscasts.[16]

Though an assessment of the negative effects of the image of work and workers in the media is not complete, it is clear that career educators must understand and attend to the media's educational function if reform is to be achieved. In other words, the effects must go beyond the school to have broad impact.

TRANSITION
FROM
EDUCATION
TO
WORK

A focus of career education theory which is of special interest to labor because of the potential impact is the area of the transition from education to work. Primarily because much remains to be reconciled in the theoretical issues about the nature of education and the nature of work among labor leaders and career educators, the education/work transition presents potential contention, too.

Career education proponents have articulated their viewpoint of this transition in virtually every phase of their documents on their reforms. Organized labor has been less concerned with the specific transition phase. For obvious reasons (their purposes and clientele), trade unions have focused on public education's impact on future workers and on humanizing the workplace for current workers, through both collective bargaining (where in effect) and "organizing the unorganized." Of course, there will need to be an attempt to initiate discussion with labor organizations on this issue, since career education must rely on cooperative efforts to define, facilitate, and implement the transition.

We will consider specific possibilities, such as the role of union education departments in lifelong learning, later in this paper. To conclude this section, it seems appropriate to quote two labor spokesmen deeply concerned with education. In the synthesis of the theoretical issues they raise may lie a meshing of viewpoints between labor and career education on the education/work nexus.

Gus Tyler, assistant president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) raises this issue in a different form than Willard Wirtz, president of the National Manpower Institute. This is logical, since Tyler operates in the primary role of union official and Wirtz in the role of manpower conceptualizer. But there are connections between Tyler's myths and Wirtz's strategies. What needs to be analyzed, in a cooperative effort of labor and education, is how much truth there is in Tyler's myths and how much myth there is in Wirtz's stratagems. Perhaps the current large-scale project of the National Manpower Institute will begin to provide answers to these questions.[17]

Tyler writes in "Career Education and Society's Imperatives," from Essays on Career Education:

> But if Career Education is to fulfill it's promise it must first relate careers to what is happening in our society, especially to what is happening in the economy... And so, to demythologize the ambience, it might be well to clear away several widely accepted myths about the economy and education...

> The Automation Myth... that the coming of automation would bring a workless world: the labor force would shrink, unemployment would rise, and the percentage of the population in the labor market would decline.
>
> The Male Myth... that the world of work is no world for women... with some exceptions, vocational (career) education is male oriented...
>
> The School Myth... that the place where learning takes place is the school. This myth confuses schooling with education...
>
> The Educational Myth... is a spin-off of the school myth. It holds that if you have enough degrees you will make enough money.
>
> The Training Myth... that if a young man or woman is trained for a job, he or she will get a job... training people for jobs without the necessary social measures to assure that the jobs are there is to use a myth to delude and ultimately to infuriate credulous people.
>
> The Specialist Myth... that the way to get a job is to learn to be an expert at something...
>
> The Myth Myth... that the way to solve problems is by perpetrating or perpetuating a myth. It offers concepts not as a guide to action but as a substitute for action... It is this myth that in the past has been responsible for many fads in education...[18]

And Wirtz enunciates "A Strategy for Change" in The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education/Work Policy:

> These things can be done:
>
> Stage One -- Enlarging Present Beachheads
>
> Proposal One: That there be established, in at least 25 cities Community Education-Work Councils through which school officials, employers, members of labor unions, and members of the public engage collaboratively in developing and administering education-work programs...

Proposal Two: That a comprehensive Occupational Outlook and Career Information reporting system be established...

Proposal Three: That it be provided, as a total community undertaking, that all high school and college students receive at least five hours per year of career guidance and counseling from both professionally trained and work- or service-experienced counselors...

Proposal Four: That it be undertaken as a community responsibility to develop and administer programs to familiarize high school youth with work and service, including the provision of opportunity for at least 500 hours of work or service experience...

Proposal Five: That a considered break of one or two years in the formal educational sequence--taken between ages sixteen and twenty-- be recognized and established as a standard optional phase of the youth experience, and that a comprehensive program of Community Internships and Work Apprenticeships be instituted at the local level...

Proposal Six: That a complete inventory be made of the extent and effect of laws, practices, and customs that constrain or otherwise influence people's movement between education and work.

Proposal Seven: That a more effective capacity for integrating education and work policy be developed at the national and state levels...

Proposal Eight: That a new Work Institute be established to stimulate collaborative effort in the private sector to maximize work satisfactions and - meaning...

Proposal Nine: That all state statutory and regulatory strictures on uses by adults of elementary and secondary public education facilities be removed or that alternative facilities be provided...

Proposal Ten: That the unemployment insurance laws and regulations be revised to permit and encourage the use of periods of unemployment for training and education, and that the "public employment" program concept be revised to include a significant training and education element...

Proposal Eleven: That the present measurements of employment and unemployment (1) be expanded to provide adequate local as well as national data, (2) be revised to reflect more accurately the vary-

> ing degrees of "economic hardship" incident to various types of situations, (3) be expanded to cover work and service performed in the home or community but not for pay, and (4) be reported and publicized in a manner differentiating fully between the various groups in the working population...
>
> Stage Two -- Interim Objectives
>
> Proposition A: That any adult who has not received twelve years of formal education be entitled to free public education at whatever level is consistent with particular individual circumstance...
>
> Proposition B: That all adults be recognized as entitled to the equivalent of one year's Deferred Educational Opportunity...
>
> Proposition C: That adequate measurements of the development and use of the human resource be made and published as part of a comprehensive set of social indicators...
>
> Proposition D: That there be an increased effort to develop a process for drawing, at the local community level, on the American citizen's authentic desire to participate more fully and directly in the improvement of the human prospect...[19]

Merely setting these outlines down, of course, does not answer the questions posed earlier. Now career education leaders must deal with Tyler's myths directly and labor leaders must critique Wirtz's proposals and propositions forthrightly. As we shall see in the sections that follow, both groups have already begun that process.

Conceptual Considerations

> *I would be happy to discuss the relationship of labor to career education. The problem is that career education has been described and programmed in so many different ways that I find it difficult to respond to a non-specific inquiry.*
>
> *-Union Education Director, in response to author's query.*[20]

This section relates to the "middle ground" of career education's conceptual framework. "Concept" is, of course, one of those words which one can write a book attempting to define. For the purposes of this paper, however, we use concept to mean simply the action-oriented, programmatic generalizations developed by the career education movement to explain and to involve the various affected publics.

In that context, we must consider four broad related areas of conflict in organized labor's relation to the career education framework:

A. the clarity of definition (and lack of it)

B. the relation of labor to public education

C. the potential narrowing of choice in career education

D. the possibility of collaborative relationship as envisioned by OE

THE DEFINITIONAL DILEMMA

What Hoyt has recently called "the definitional dilemma" is probably the most significant conflict area between career educators and labor leaders.[21] In the preceding section we delineated some of the theoretical antipathies relating to theories of education and work.

At the conceptual level the debate continues.

"Work" specifically defined is at the crux of the argument. OE's redefinition of work is widely known and highly-regarded among educators, perhaps, but sometimes unknown and dis-regarded by labor spokespersons.

Contrast, for example, these definitions. The first is from OE's policy statement; the second, William Faulkner (quoted by Studs Terkel in Working):

> "Work" is conscious effort, other than that involved in activities whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others.[22]

****

> You can't eat for eight hours a day nor drink for eight hours a day nor make love for eight hours a day-- all you can do for eight hours is work. Which is the reason why man makes himself and everybody else so miserable and unhappy.[23]

Granted that Faulkner is more poetic than OE, the fact remains that these concepts of work are almost diametrically opposed.

Hoyt has admitted in recent material that career education's redefinition of work faces a tortuous road to public acceptance. The question, however, is whether labor organizations will ever agree to the distinctions Hoyt proposes.

Will the trade unions accept, for example, the notion that "labor" is "a condition which is disliked, is performed largely only for survival purposes, and which brings little, if any, personal sense of accomplishment or pride to the individual"? What does organized labor gain by accepting Hoyt's characterization of "leisure" as "activities, other than sleeping, in which one engages when not performing in his or her vocation"?[24]

The implications of the definitional dilemma become clearer when the goal of education as preparation for work is discussed. Labor has been distrustful of this concept, suspecting that, in actuality, all the distinctions aside, vocational/occupational/career education is merely a disguised form of tracking. This suspicion may be beginning to abate, but a reluctance remains on labor's part to make a wholehearted commitment to career education.

A partial explanation for the hesitation is labor's perception that its people have been unwelcome in the formulation of the definitions (see the next section for specific evidences). Why, they ask, is there no reference to worker organization in OE's ten "Basic Concept Assumptions of Career Education"?[25] If this represents the "philosophical base for current career education efforts," has there been adequate consultation with unions, and does the outcome adequately reflect a labor presence?

Labor, in a word, desires clarification. Many union representatives have read and comprehend the current OE definition:

> "Career education" is the totality of experiences through which one learns about and prepares to engage in work as part of her or his way of living.[26]

But they feel estranged from this conceptualization since it does not clarify some of their perceptions of underlying issues. And since OE's current stance is self-consciously in the liberal humanist tradition, there is all the more reason for labor's concern. For, historically, they feel, humanistic liberal reforms have often been at their consitutents' expense with little or no gain.

"The interest of the American labor movement in public education is basic," writes Carroll Hutton, Director of the UAW Education Department. He continues:

LABOR AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

> Throughout its history, organized labor has favored a broad, realistic, and enriched curriculum for public education, and has believed that the gulf between education experiences and life experiences should be narrowed and merged into a unified and meaningful totality.[27]

Hutton is writing in the introduction to a carefully documented and professionally-produced UAW publication entitled "Labor's Historic Support of Public Education: A Chronology." The next 85 pages chronicle that history from 1820 to 1974, interspersed with a compendium of dozens of quotations on the nature of education, ranging from Aristotle to Leonard Woodcock. It is an impressive rendition of a theme that recurs in the labor literature.

Or, as Tyler says in his essay "Career Education and Society's Imperatives,"

> Over these many decades, American labor has continued its original interest in a system of education that would prepare people for a life in the workplace and the community.[28]

Career education's assertion that it sees itself as a movement for total educational reform is viewed by labor, given the aforementioned definitional dilemma, as potentially troublesome. As over 9,000 schools at the elementary and secondary level have adopted some form of career development program-- and 3% of the systems have enacted comprehensive programs-- the labor movement views these developments with apprehension, particularly in the wake of programs allowing the private sector to take control of some elements within the public schools that labor generally opposed, such as performance contracting and voucher plans.

Labor organizations will not support career education unequivocally until the educators can assure them-- unequivocally-- that the implementation of *perparation for work* concepts does *not* mean the future demise of the public school system.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council in 1972 expressed one form of concern for the "narrowing" effect of career education:

NARROWING OR BROADENING OF CHOICE

> It is difficult to avoid the implication that what is really involved is not so much an upgrading of career education as an effort to find an excuse for less federal support for higher education...
> The AFL-CIO supports career education but we will not allow it to be won at the expense of narrowing opportunities for higher education.[29]

This passage refers to the narrowing effect of career education plans on educational *institutions*. A corollary, and perhaps even more strongly held, concern of organized labor-- arising out of their perceptions of the long-running controversy over "dual system" education-- is the narrowing effect of career education for *individuals*.

"One of the bad tendencies of the career educators," Sessions writes, "is to force young people-- directly or indirectly-- to make career decisions too early." [30] This statement correlates closely with other critical evaluations of the OE model of career development.

Until the career education movement can produce evidence that their concepts *increase* rather than *decrease* options for students as they advance through the educational system, much of organized labor will remain on the sidelines as interested observers-- but not on the field as zealous participants.

This issue seems to be a key point that needs resolution in the career education debate. Sessions has noted that many authors seem "to have read closely some of the labor documents on the subject and decided they share labor's concerns."[31] He goes on to clarify the way that labor has been anxious that

> career education may treat students as simply future economic producers, rather than flesh and blood people who are workers but who are also consumers, members of family groups, citizens of the community and the world and individuals striving to fulfill the best that is in them.[32]

His assessment that others outside of labor share this view is corroborated by such indications as the following assessment, written by an educator active in career education, in a letter to the author:

> Organized labor because of its hostility to equating a career with an occupation, is one of the strongest forces available to support a broad concept of career education.[33]

BUSINESS-LABOR-INDUSTRY COLLABORATION

It would appear to be, at the very least, a tactical error to sandwich "Labor" between "Business" and "Industry" in describing that "community." But it is not merely impolite syntax: career educators may be committing a conceptual sin in this construction.

Hoyt has listed at least seven ways in which career education hopes the "business-labor-industry" community will collaborate:

1. Serving as resource persons in classrooms
2. Offering observational work experiences for students and educators
3. Providing knowledge and consultation concerning the nature of work.
4. Assist schools to aid students in transition to work roles

5. Humanizing the work environment
6. Encouraging career education in the educational system
7. Helping define and promote productive use of leisure time[34]

We have indicated on previous pages why some of these goals may be unclear or inadequate to unions. The additional point to stress here is the apparently careless and possibly destructive formulation of business, industry, and labor as bonded together in a community of interest. There are, as noted above, real sources of conflict and antagonism between management and labor. To submerge these differences in a haphazard construct that invites facile statements which do not correspond to social reality is to invite disastrous consequences. Again, a conceptual clarification will be demanded by labor and is very much in order.

It is useful to conclude this section with a methodology similar to the preceding conclusion. That is, a comparison of two divergent lists is helpful to assess where we need to go from here.

For one set we return to the early statement of concepts of Marland's Career Education. He presents ten concepts which emerged from the First National Conference on Career Education, sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Though Marland asserts that labor had a high degree of participation in the partnership which produced these concepts, it may be more useful to analyze the listing as the "management agenda" for educational reform. The concepts are:

1. Exchange programs between business-labor-industry and school personnel.

2. Field trips for students

3. Work experience for all school students

4. School-industry job placement programs

5. Occupational Resource Persons

6. Year-round school staffed partly by business-labor-industrial personnel

7. Retired workers as resource persons

8. Work as more personally satisfying to the individual worker

9. Every student leaving school equipped with a marketable job skill

10. Every student leaving school able to find work [35]

For comparison (and it is also interesting to contrast the above program with Wirtz and Tyler and what follows) here is an early list of "Questions One Might Ask of Career Education." It was prepared by Kenneth R. Edwards, Director, Skill Improvement Training, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

1. Will Career Education work?

2. Will it supply dignity to the "world of work?"

3. Will our present teachers be capable of teaching the "world of work?"

4. How will teachers gain the actual on-the-job experience needed to make career education work and at whose expense?

5. Can students be taught and will they accept the ethics of work?

6. Can a student make a tentative career choice by the end of kindergarten? Can he make a choice of the career or careers he wishes to explore by the end of the 6th grade? Will he be mature by the 9th grade to actually make a firm choice of an occupation?

7. Will employers, who now require a baccalaureate degree, lower their standards to accept career educated employees?

8. How will present schools meet the needs for career counseling and placement?

9. What will be the overall effect of vocational skill training in a formal education environment?

10. How many workers will be displaced when attempts are made to place teachers and students on jobs to gain work experience?

11. Can parents accept career education as a direct replacement for the time honored dream of a college education for their children and how may parent attitudes be changed?

12. Will the occupational community be used as a source of information or will the educators assume that they know what is best?

13. Who will evaluate career education and serve as a source of observation? The educators, the government, the general public or the occupational community?

14. How will work, itself, be made meaningful to all?

15. Can the organizational and administrative structure of education be changed to accept the full impact of career education?

16. Will the proposed benefits to be gained exceed the cost?

17. Will so much emphasis on the "world of work" tend to lower the intellectual level of this country, making it somewhat backwards?

18. Will career education cause a flood on the labor market of semi-trained persons and in the long-run, reduce wages and working conditions?[36]

Despite any assertions by career educators to the contrary, these questions of the conceptual framework and theoretical bases of career education remain unanswered or only partially answered. Proof of this state of affairs is available in the practical applications of the concepts, the subject of the operational considerations section which follows.

Operational Considerations

> *Even accepting for the sake of argument the philosophy of this project, we have grave doubts about its possible implementation... We continue to believe that career education, properly interpreted, has an important place in the reformation of the school curriculum, and that the reformation of that curriculum should be a subject of major attention. We do not wish the school system to clean its house by abandoning it and moving into ours.*
>
> *--Department of Research & Education,*
> *International Union of Operating Engineers, 1973*[37]

There is an organic relationship between the instances of practical application of career education concepts which we examine here and the recommendations for change which follow.

The "heft" of this section, however, may give the delusion that it is of secondary import in comparison to other aspects of this paper. This is illusory. There is a simple explanation for the paucity of examples of interaction, best phrased by an educator who wrote to the author,

> I am sorry that my response has been so tardy. However, this most probably reflects that there are very few successful interactions between labor and the schools. I am very sorry to admit this sad state of affairs but note that educators, as a whole, have been less than enthusiastic in dealing with organized labor.[38]

Four distinct but interrelated categories, each of which is discussed separately, constitute the operational considerations we must address. These are:

The "Turf" problem

Roles of participants in the schools

Labor as a curricular subject

Work-experience and economic realities

THE "TURF" PROBLEM

The issue raised in the statement by the Operating Engineers which appears above is essentially a question of "turf." We use this word with the conscious intention of invoking images of the colloquial meanings associated with "turf," for at the core this is an issue of institutional territory, of what is appropriate for the School and the Union.

The document from which the operating engineers statement is lifted is a good example of the territorial issue. Entitled "A Critical Analysis of the Texas Education Agency-- United States Office of Education 'Career Education Cluster Plan,'" it was adopted by the AFL-CIO in convention as a policy statement in 1973. While it is not necessary to quote extensively from the statement, the following excerpts provide some of the flavor of the critique:

> The USOE-Texas Education Agency's career education "construction cluster" proposal is seriously misguided both in conception and in detail-- in strategy and tactics.
>
> *****************
>
> Every heavy equipment apprenticeship program spends more per student training operating engineers than the richest public school district spends per student in all subjects combined. The public schools couldn't duplicate this investment, *nor should they*.
>
> *****************
>
> The schools should give students a better idea of the challenges and possibilities available in the world of work. In the construction industry, the Industrial Arts Curriculum Projects *World of Construction* series is a step in the right direction.[39]

These sorts of specific points critiquing existing career education practices must be taken into account in ongoing activities. Leaving aside the work-experience issue for the moment, the issue raised here regarding whose turf the description and organization of job details should be is a major one. In response to the author's generalized request for information on their career education activities, many unions sent examples of their work in the area of job description. The Associated Artistes and Actors of America, for example, described their publications on acting.[40] American Federation of Musicians responded with several slickly-produced brochures on music careers.[41] The Telecommunications International Union sent job descriptions for careers in the telephone industry.[42]

These are only a few examples; there are many more, which include occupations as diverse as electrical workers, barbers, and bartenders. What has been amply demonstrated is that unions consider career development materials in their own fields to be their right and responsibility-- in short, their turf. The questions they raise regard the practice of career educators who, either through ignorance or choice, disregard these materials, and in consequence invade labor's turf.

ROLES OF SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS

The previous issue is directly related to the issue of the function of the public school. At the conceptual level, as we have seen, this takes the form of historic support by unions for public education. At the operational level, the form is the roles of those who are associated with schooling.

"I have never attempted to milk a cow," writes John Sessions in "Unions, Education and Employment," "but I am vain enough to think that I could develop a better curriculum on how to do it than could most dairy farmers."[43] In the same article, he spells it out:

> I am convinced that teaching is a highly skilled profession... Students...learn...better if the learning takes place under the direction of a professionally qualified teacher.[44]

The implication is that career education must, first, be more careful in clarifying the roles of the classroom teacher and others associated with the enterprise and, second, maintain public control of public schooling. Elsewhere Sessions has stated flatly that labor was totally opposed to OE's "employer-based model" for career education.[45] It is not difficult to anticipate, then, labor's anxiety over career education and the relationship of "outside forces" to the schools. This has, in fact, been the case at the operational level. As one educator stated to the author,

> Organized labor contributes very little to career education at the local school level. The adversary relationship they have with management seems to carry over... This provides a particularly adverse effect when contrasted with the general cooperation received from business and industry.[46]

We will return to this issue in a slightly modified form when we discuss work experience. It remains an obstacle to be removed before effective implementation at the local level can occur.

Previous discussions of the image of work and of the lack of knowledge of labor history among educators and its consequences in the career education curriculum have touched on another practical problem in the view of unions. In general, the issue is the absence of labor studies at all levels of schooling. Specifically, the question is one of career educators' commitment to their student's learning about the role of unions in their future jobs.

LABOR
IN
THE
CURRICULUM

Stephen H. Confer, of the Communications Workers of America (CWA) Headquarters/Staff Training, delineated the issue succinctly:

> In addition to the obvious reasons why labor's point of view should be considered, membership and involvement in a union may well be an important part of the young persons' working life, a part which has been ignored by specialists in career education up to this time.[47]

And W.H. McClennan, President of the International Association of Firefighters, has commented on the broader issue:

> It is my conviction that it is essential to an improvement in this general situation for schools at all levels to provide adequate, unprejudiced instruction in labor history, organization and functioning. This should begin in high school and should certainly be offered at the university level.[48]

Because such instruction has not been a part of the career education model in the past, labor has again avoided an enthusiastic commitment to implementation.

WORK
EXPERIENCE

Of all the impediments to practical application of career education concepts, labor's attitude toward work-experience may be the most significant. Because the theory and practice of work-experience in education touches upon so many elements of real or perceived conflict between labor interests and management interests, it may well prove to be the issue that ultimately determines the outcome of many of the other facets of the labor-education relationship.

Though other factors have appeared in the debate over work experience, there seem to be five primary areas urgently requiring recognition in practice:

1) remuneration;
2) protective labor laws;
3) productivity;
4) unemployment; and
5) apprenticeships.

Let us look more closely at each.

1) Remuneration: To career educators the question of paid versus unpaid work experience is open to debate. Hoyt, among others, has indicated that he sees a need for both forms; he conceives a spectrum of activities culminating in paid work experience "as the student moves closer to making bonafide occupational choices."[49]

In contrast, unions view unpaid work experience as anathema. As Sessions has noted,

> Discussions about learners in the workplace tend to proceed with equanimity until the concept becomes sullied by the practical subject of remuneration.[50]

We necessarily return to this subject throughout the remainder of this discussion. But, to generalize, on the "practical subject of remuneration," there is a basic conflict on the question of whether students should be paid. Educators say, "Sometimes; how often depends on the nature of the experience." Unionists retort, "Hardly ever, and we will say when."

2) Protective Labor Laws: Union leaders consider the possibility of the destruction of minimum wage and child labor laws through mis-applied work experience programs as a problem of intense degree. As Thomas F. Murphy, president of the International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftsmen, wrote to the author, unions are

> extremely mindful and sensitive to the hazards of violations of child labor laws, and the performance of work in frustration of minimum wage laws, not to mention negotiated and prevailing rates.[51]

Sessions has written extensively on this area, bluntly stating in one essay,

> Labor will not permit the erosion of the negotiated wage structure. Nor will labor permit violations of the child-labor laws in the name of education.[52]

Given the depth of union concern with this aspect of the work experience, the literature and spokespersons of career education have been woefully unresponsive in their reassurances that student workers do not in practical consequence negate organized labor's historical task.

3) Productivity: "The changes called for by career education," according to Hoyt, "can, in my opinion, be viewed as making some contributions toward increasing productivity."[53] Productivity's relationship to education and the workplace is actually a

much broader issue than only work experience aspects. We raise it here specifically to point out labor's fear that students in the workplace will be manipulated by management to promote "speed up" in the job situation.

This is by no means a fantastic bit of labor propaganda in the ongoing battle with management. Labor leaders have interpreted this as a result of their experience with interns in several specific situations. And as Wirtz indicates, in a slightly different context, in The Boundless Resource:

> This effort and these prospects cannot be isolated from the concerns of the American labor movement. Workers and their jobs are the essence of what unions are about. Unions, since their inception, have concerned themselves with working conditions, pay, hours of work, fringe benefits, grievance procedures, representation in general, and other agenda items not easily distinguishable from whatever is meant to be implied by "quality of work." It is the unfortunate fact that unprincipled opportunists have tried to exploit these new approaches as effective "union busting" tactics. Because increased productivity is unquestionably a principal, and entirely legitimate, concern of many management participants in these job enrichment and job redesign efforts, there will be a natural tendency among union leaders to suspect these as being merely more elegant names for the old-fashioned speed-up-- one more way to exact higher profits from the eight-hour day[54]

Until unions see pragmatic evidence that work experience is not merely an elegant name for speed-up, they will be contentious about their workplace prerogatives.

4) Unemployment: There is a very concrete, practical side to the issue of full employment in the economy and career education: When there are not enough jobs for workers, who need to

work to live, it is impossible to create jobs for students who are "exploring careers." As Sessions points out,

> On-the-job education programs don't work in periods of substantial unemployment... Under conditions of widespread unemployment, it is the educational program which will go down the drain, at least in unionized industries.[55]

Another dimension of the unemployment issue involves the effect of expanded career awareness and opportunity for traditionally excluded groups, such as women and minorities.

Robert Lindsey reports in the September 12, 1976 "New York Times", that:

> During the last two years, and expecially in 1976, women have entered the job market at a pace called "extraordinary" by Alan Greenspan, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors... their decisions to return to work have torpedoed... forecasts of a leveling off of the nation's unemployment rate at 7 percent by the end of this year...[56]

The implications for work experience are clear. If the worker sees the student down the line or at the next desk as potentially taking a fellow unionist's job away after graduation (and, with the realities of racism and sexism, this will be particularly true if the student is black or female), that worker as a good trade unionist must oppose in principle the on-the-job education practice.

It is an ironic contradiction: the positive effect of career education (and the women's movement, in this specific example) in encouraging job awareness and expanded vision helps to create the negative consequence of increased unemployment and worker alienation.

5) Apprenticeships: In the viewpoint of organized labor, a critical area in which career educators must clarify their intentions is that of apprenticeship programs. Many unions have worked hard to build such programs on a contractual basis with management, and are suspicious of any real or apparent attempt at erosion of these programs.

To unions the apprenticeship is the vehicle which permits work-experience in a learning situation within the context of negotiated labor-management structures. Elsewhere in this paper we discuss some examples of this context: in the building trades, in the "turf" question to some extent, and so on. In considering the operation of career education concepts in practice we can point to these examples as areas of actual and potential conflict on apprenticeship-related questions.

There have been, of course, counter-examples of smoothly-functioning programs which have pleased both labor leaders and educators in their operation. But to increase the awareness level of career development conceptualizers on this issue we need to point to instances in which things did not run smoothly. Any implementation of career education concepts, in other words, which avoids, neglects or negates the established apprenticeship programs which it touches upon will probably find itself in serious trouble, and probably sooner rather than later.

We will give the last word on work experience and labor to a career education expert working closely with labor on the local level. His analysis sums up our previous discussion and serves as a transition to the following sections on strategies for change:

> As representative organizations, labor unions by their very nature must support the interests of their current members, rather than those of potential new members. Students are only potential members with zero seniority. Any appeal in behalf of students is balanced against the needs, real or otherwise, of current members... While unions do not hire people they surely do prevent people from being hired. This contributes to the negative image of always opposing everything which organized labor sometimes has... The protection afforded by a union contract is meaningless to the person who has no job. Only after you get the job does it take on meaning.
>
> As a career educator interested in preparing students for employment as a meaningful part of a total career, the last thing I need is organized labor curtailing my opportunities to place students on sites where actual work experience can be gained. Yet this is precisely what happens. Students are often placed in non-union situations with lower pay and benefits because there is no way we can gain a placement in a union situation. As I see it, many labor leaders think career education is fine as long as it takes place totally within the confines of a school. Any real world experience that amounts to more than visiting and observing is verboten. However, many students need the experience of actually doing, not merely to gain skill but as a motivational device. They need desperately to learn that they can achieve, that they are competent, that they are capable of acting on the world rather than constantly reacting to it. If they can gain this knowledge it then acts as a stimulus to achievement of academic skills.[57]

PART II - STRATEGIES

There has been much current emphasis in the schools on "career education." In an effort to make the development of career education realistic and meaningful, the AFL-CIO nationally and its affiliated unions and state federations have been deeply involved in planning activities. The active involvement of labor in the earliest phases of planning is essential if career education programs are to be successful. In an unfortunate number of situations employers have been invited to participate in career education planning but unions have not. In other instances, it has sometimes appeared that it was not labor's advice which has been wanted so much as its seal of approval.

Labor representatives have effectively expressed their concern with this narrow approach to career education. Some of the most blatantly misguided career education proposals have been shelved among them "the employer-based model of career education," a plan which was strongly opposed by the AFL-CIO.

Labor has warned against permitting vaguely thought through career education plans to convert the schools into little more than job training institutions. Relating education to the world of work is important, but it is equally important that education be related to preparing students for the demands of citizenship, for their future roles as members of their families, and for the fullest development of their human potential. Although most of the official spokesmen for career education pay lip service to this principle, their actions do not always follow their rhetoric.

Considering the importance which has been placed on career education, it is remarkable that it has received almost no funding in its own right. Schools everywhere are building "career information centers" out of free literature, a very undependable way of gathering reliable information.

What money has been available for career education has been largely taken from discretionary funds appropriated under the Vocational Education Act. This means that to the extent that career education prospers, there is less money for vocational education.

Equally alarming have been the continuing efforts of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare to explore ways to relax child labor and minimum wage laws for teenagers. In a period of high unemployment, the inevitable result of relaxing these laws would be to encourage employers to hire low-wage teenagers at the expense of adult workers.

--"The AFL-CIO Platform Proposals," 1976[58]

As much as possible, in this part of the paper, organized labor speaks not via the author's interpretations, but for itself.

It seems to be a fact of action-oriented research that the portion suggesting specific proposals or recommendations is always far shorter than the section oriented toward intellectual, abstract and/or analytical discussion. This is partially a function of the predilection of researchers to pontificate and philosophize. This is not, we hope, the predominant operant factor in this particular research paper. Rather, the author maintains, in this case the cause is the level of lack of interest and participation in career education by unions thus far. A necessary consequence of this low level of input is a relatively low level of output in the form of analytical statements and position papers. This situation is rapidly changing, as is labor's attitude toward the potential benefits of career education.

But the past neglect of the career education movement by the labor movement (and vice versa) is reflected in these comments submitted to the author by union spokespersons:

> Unfortunately, I cannot answer your questions on career education simply because we have no current information, studies, or experience...[59]

****

> I'm afraid there's not much more we can tell you. We are maintaining our interest however, even though it is not one of our top priorities.[60]

****

> I regret to tell you that we have no data that would be of assistance to you... Our main concerns are elsewhere, and as a consequence we have neither collected nor developed the material upon which to base a public position.[61]

Clearly, it is now the responsibility of both labor leaders and career educators to take each other seriously and begin to work out methods of implementation. When active unions are the rule and passive unions the exception, progress will have been made.

Hoyt, in a recent address, listed the "basic restraints to implementation" as the following "Obstacles":

1. The Pendulum Problem of "bringing a proper emphasis to education, as preparation for work."
2. The Impotence Image that "the greatest power of career education lies in its complete impotence-- in its absolute dependence on the increased strengthening of a wide variety of existing educational programs."
3. The Definitional Dilemma of "our attempt to redefine the four-letter word, "work"-- and so to change the meaning of education as preparation for work."
4. The Teacher Trap that insists that "while career education is a truly collaborative effort, the classroom teacher is the key person involved in its success-- or its failure."
5. The Collaborative Quandary, or the problem of "crying for educational reform while admitting, from the outset, that educators will never be able to bring about this reform by themselves."[62]

Every aspect of these restraints has direct connections to career education vis-a-vis organized labor. One can state it more strongly: labor is inextricably involved in all five "obstacles" and can choose to help or to hinder each situation.

The sections which follow begin to explore the short- and long-range consequences of this reality.

Short-Range Implementation

An Introduction to Career Education lists five initial implementation tasks for the "business-labor-industry" community:

1. Provide observational, work experience, and work-study opportunities for students and for those who educate students...
2. Serve as career development resource personnel...
3. Participate in part-time-and full-time placement programs.
4. Participate actively and positively in programs designed to reduce worker alienation.
5. Participate in career education policy formulation.[63]

Before labor enthusiastically embraces its role (and its bedfellows) in this communal pursuit, it has its own initial implementation agenda to which career education must respond. Labor's agenda has not been stated as succinctly as OE's, but by interpolating from various statements in recent years, it is possible to classify the labor plan for implementation into three general task-oriented proposals:

A. Increase the participation of organized labor in ongoing career development programs, and make certain it is understood that such participation justifiably reflects the interests and needs of workers in the workplace.

B. Reconsider and revise the framework for work-experience to take into account labor's view of economic realities (such as unemployment) and the needs of workers for protection from management incursions (such as in negotiated wage structure and productivity).

C. Encourage the infusion of labor studies programs as part of comprehensive career education at all school levels, with union involvement in curriculum development.

These proposals reflect the initiative of specific labor organizations and individuals. The remainder of this section documents these initiatives by citing the sources from which the above proposals evolved.

PROPOSAL A

"I find little in the literature of career education," writes John Sessions, "which sees labor as a creative resource."[64] He sees the question of how to involve organized labor as straightforward and simple:

> In developing career programs, ...the manpower training arm of organized labor is the Human Resources Development Institute... Their nearest field representatives can be contacted by calling the AFL-CIO local central body... and the time to do it is the morning of the first day that you decide it might be a good idea to begin a career development program...[65]

Al Lorente of the UAW has proposed advisory committees at federal, state, regional and local levels in which organized labor will play a leading role. Here is Lorente's list of what can be expected of labor representatives on these committees:

--Assistance as new goals and objectives are developed for public education, making it more relevant to the true needs of students.

--Assistance in the recruitment of a cadre of resource personnel from organized labor who can supplement guidance and counseling activities.

--Lend assistance in the expansion of cooperative and distributive educational programs, harnessing the wealth of learning potential provided by the total community.

- --Assist in confirming needed performance indicators or objectives, that are developed for students. These indicators, or objectives, could relate to all instructional areas, whether it be career development, academic, vocational or technical subject areas.

- --Provide input to develop , support and endorse new funding mechanisms that are needed to improve public education and insure that quality education is made available to all students involved in the public education process.[66]

In a significant endorsement, Lorente has expressed general agreement with OE's approaches; the UAW believes that they are basically "on the right track." But Lorente has publicly expressed one suggestion specifically aimed at OE and its organizational patterns. In congressional testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor in February, 1976, he commented on a UAW "special concern":

> That concern centers around the fact that there is no representative from organized labor on the National Advisory Council for Career Education. This glaring omission has created resentment, suspicion and hostility toward career education from various sectors of organized labor.[67]

That same testimony contained other comments related to labor involvement. Lorente suggested expanding "the definition of career education to include more than job awareness, exploration, decision-making and planning."[68] And he goes on to describe how the UAW developed its positions in part through contact with the Michigan Career Education Advisory Commission. Their participation there, in fact, leads Lorente to predict that:

> when and if a representative from organized labor sits on the National Advisory Council, promotion and implementation of career education will be accomplished much easier.[69]

It will be interesting to see if (and when) this prediction proves accurate in the future.

In his congressional testimony, Lorente identifies another area of involvement for labor-- encouraging policy-making bodies to fully fund career education programs. He refers to the specific provisions of the bill (HR 11023) under consideration and suggests expanding the funding provisions and removing the strict time lines to make funding more readily available to school districts.

These comments are a direct predecessor to the proposals offered by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) in a Resolution of their August, 1976, convention. Some of their implementation guidelines deal with long-range implications and are discussed in the next section. But other proposals have merit as short-range action tasks:

-Job training programs should be expanded

-Information about careers should be compiled and made generally available

-Adult education programs must be expanded

-Restrictions against adult use of schools should be re-examined[70]

Looking backward, to 1974, the Resolution on "Education in General" by the 16th International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (IUE) Convention contains ten points directly addressing career education:

1. Reorder priorities to stress education
2. Support grants to develop non-sexist curricular materials and programs
3. Fight sexism and racism in education

4. Encourage educational innovations
5. Replace regressive taxes with direct federal funding for schools
6. Increase funding for vocational and adult education, provided it is broadly-construed
7. Continue to fight for increased funds for higher education
8. Support a program of 16 years of free public education for all
9. Recommend renewed efforts to end school segregation and encourage cultural pluralism
10. Support broad-based democratic decision-making in the educational system[71]

All of these examples point to the same end: greater labor involvement in career education theory, concepts, and operation. "Many... pitfalls...could have been avoided," asserts Sessions, "had there been better involvement of organized labor in developing plans for career education."[72]

PROPOSAL B

Since we have dealt so extensively with this issue in previous sections, we will let suffice here three statements regarding on-the-job education which articulate a labor perspective. The first is from Al Lorente's previously-cited testimony:

> The proposed legislation should specify that work experience means non-paid work experience.
>
> We are also of the firm opinion that student hands-on activities, with employers, which involves direct remuneration, will surely lead toward justification to change child labor laws and relax minimum wage standards. Further, there is a distinct danger that this activity jeopardizes the job security of the existing work force. Viable alternatives to this

activity can be developed.[73]

The second is contained in the AFT's recent resolution:

> Alternative programs which have a career orientation may be provided for students... While some of these may involve work experience, they must be carefully constructed so that they are clearly the responsibility of the public school system...
>
> Where career education programs involve any kind of experience at the job site they should be tried only in industries where there is full employment and where no adult workers will be displaced...[74]

In the third, Sessions comments on a specific proposition regarding remuneration:

> If educationally-designed work experiences involve unusual training costs for the employer, if the student worker is not able to perform as the employer expects his regular apprentices to perform, then the answer is not to lower the pay scales but to provide subsidization for the employer. Subsidization should not be provided by tax credits, but by contracts, and only where the employer can demonstrate that the costs of the training are substantial. Here again, it is evident that planning the work experience must be a cooperative effort of the schools, the employers, and the unions.[75]

The reader may judge the accuracy and feasibility of these statements as concepts. Educators must respond to the concerns and perceptions of organized labor as they implement programs in local school systems. We return to Sessions who aptly sums up:

> All in all, on-the-job educational programs then can be a valuable part of the total educational experience provided that they are controlled by public-education authorities as a component of a complete curriculum, provided that employers, unions and other relevant community groups participate in the initial and continuous planning on a basis of equality, and provided that as a nation we adopt policies designed to create a full-employment economy.[76]

Not only the children of working-class families but all Americans need to know more about the history of labor in this country. As Richard O. Boyer and

PROPOSAL
C

Herbert Morris stress in Labor's Untold Story,

> Labor's story, still untold and largely missing from textbooks and conventional history, is more than an account of strikes, spies, and frame-ups, of organizing and building unions, of men and women fighting and dying for better lives in a better America...
>
> Fundamentally, labor's story is the story of the American people. To view it narrowly, to concentrate on the history of specific trade unions or on the careers of individuals and their rivalries would be to miss the point that the great forces which have swept the American people into action have been the very forces that have also molded labor.[77]

This will stand as an excellent conceptual framework for the task at hand, but the implementation of that goal of spreading labor's story is far from accomplished. It is the unionists' contention that the career education movement, both as an act of good faith and in the interests of academic and curricular completeness, must infuse the study of labor into the career development concept.

Labor, it goes without saying, will be delighted to help in this enterprise. Career educators may draw on the organizational expertise of union education departments and follow the models of union-school cooperation which have produced such ventures as the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees - College of New Rochelle "District 37 Campus"; the District 65 - Distributive Workers of America - Hofstra University "Institute of Applied Social Science"; and the AFL-CIO Labor Studies Center.[78] These are just three among other current examples of the historical precedent of union involvement in the education of workers, stretching nearly a century and a half.

Career education, too, may depend on the expert aid of unions in the development of relevant curriculum and instructional materials. The UAW education department, for example, has produced sophisticated programmed textbooks on work-related issues.[79] As another example, in a collaborative effort of representatives from educational and labor organizations, a comprehensive curriculum package called "Labor Unions: Progress and Promise" has been produced.

According to one of the developers, Hal Kessler, the material was developed because the response to the question "does the curriculum include a substantial and fair treatment of the role of organized labor in American society?" must be answered in the negative. He continues:

> There is a great deal that has to be done by way of labor education within the union, but I suggest that even more important is the fact that all teachers... have an obligation to deal with the problems and progress of the American labor movement in their classrooms.[80]

Among the topics covered, besides an historical perspective on unionism, are:

-the structure and functions of unions

-collective bargaining

-contracts

-grievances and grievance procedures

-the role of unions in the community

It is this sort of study material that organized labor wants to see as a part of the career curriculum.

And what of the outcome for the learners after they study such materials? Gus Tyler phrases it best in a series of questions that point the way:

> I should like to see a thoroughgoing review and revision of textbooks and school curricula with an eye to the image of labor and the labor movement. Who built our railroads-- I mean who built it, not who financed it? Our canals, highways, skyscrapers, tunnels? Who created our work songs, our sea chanties, our plantation melodies? Who ended child labor, opened free schools, established clinics, provided housing, battled for major humane legistation over a century and a half? What is a union, a contract, a grievance, a strike? Why have men and women died for their union as they have died for their country? Who is William Sylvis, Samuel Gompers, Phillip Randolph, John Mitchell, Mother Jones, Andrew Furuseth, Morris Hilquit, Bill Haywood? In short, there is a great heritage in American labor that, properly related, would create pride in being one of that great class that works-- really works-- for a living.[81]

Long Range Implications

In the long-term view, what are the implications of the issues we have raised and the implementation strategies we have discussed? For answers, we need to return to our most helpful sources-- the OE policy paper and the union spokespersons.

Taken as a whole, three sections of An Introduction to Career Education serve as the foundation for a long-range outlook on the prospects for such educational reform to succeed. The twenty-five "programmatic assumptions" provide a set of researchable hypotheses to stimulate developmental probes. Nine "learner outcomes," listed as essential goals, demonstrate the framework for evaluating individual accomplishment as students leave schools. And the fourteen "basic educational changes championed by career education" enunciate a manifesto for innovation by which one can judge the broad impact of the movement on educational insitutitons.[82]

The OE paper finds three basic implications in the assumptions, outcomes, and changes they propose. These are:

1. Though initial career education reforms are not expensive, total educational reform will be.
2. Much of the additional money required is available in tax-supported educational systems outside the public K-16 systems.
3. The days of educational isolationism are over.[83]

In terms of organized labor's relationship to these reforms, there seem to be three long-term strategies which correspond in some ways to the implications of OE's formulation. Briefly these can be summarized as:

A. *Clarification by unions of their positions on career education and increased initiative to gain acceptance of their concepts within the career education movement.*

B. *Expansion and modification of work-experience to include union-sponsored apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs-- in theory and practice.*

C. *Recognition and consolidation of the role of labor education in interpreting and implementing life-long learning.*

Each of these three long range propositions needs to be examined more closely.

PROPOSITION A

As an outgrowth of their perception of exclusion from definitional processes in the early stages of the career education movement, unions have become more assertive in demanding representation and consultation. In the long run this is a healthy and positive phenomenon. Even now many labor correspondents have indicated to the author increased confidence in the evolving conceptual framework for career development programs. OE's policy paper, in fact, did have labor input and was a solid first step toward facilitating collaboration.

A concrete advantage of labor support will be the historical "clout" unions have been able to provide in lobbying for funding for public education. If organized labor will throw its weight behind career education, that alliance will provide resolute and formidable power as the reforms move from the initial demonstration (and inexpensive) to the total infusion (and expensive) phases.

Another development relevant to this discussion should be encouraged by career educators. Unions are beginning to issue specific and detailed resolutions and statements on education and work. The more codified material available from labor, the better able career educators will be to respond to clearly-stated critique and analysis of their plans. This process will clear up misunderstandings, on the one hand, and highlight any deep philosophical and theoretical differences, on the other. Both parties to the debate will know which issues are trivial and which substantial. Clear and reasoned responses will follow.

Because this initiative on the part of organized labor to clarify their attitudes toward career education in formal position papers is so significant, three of the recent statements are reproduced in their entirety in the appendix: The 1974 IUE Resolution "Education in General," the 1976 "UAW Career Education Statement," and the 1976 AFT Resolution "Education and Work" deserve careful reading for what they may portend.

PROPOSITION B

Relating both to the question of non-public school education and to isolationism is the long-term implication of the union attitude toward work-experience. Without reviving our earlier debate about paid vs. unpaid, labor laws, etc., what seems to need intensive exploration is the relationship of work-experience in career education to apprenticeships in labor education.

Unions have taken the position that much of the work-experience career educators want students to have can take place within the framework of already established on-the-job educational opportunities sponsored by organized labor. This position would appear to answer OE's request to seek supportive funding for career education in alternative educational systems.

It is, for example, to a large extent tax-supported: through the U.S. Department of Labor alone, more than 400,000 people at a cost of $35 million a year are involved in union-sponsored training.[84] In one case, a summer program for vocational exploration jointly sponsored by the AFL-CIO and the National Alliance of Businessmen has received Labor Department funding.[85] And there needs to be more study of organized labor's role at the state level, as in the instance of their support of trade/technical programs in the Wisconsin vocational, technical and adult education institutions, and the exemplary participation by the UAW in Michigan.

Unions can also help to end educational isolationism.

PROPOSITION C

Through labor education programs unions are already deeply involved in adult education. As Norman Eiger, Associate Director of the Rutgers University Labor Education Center, writes,

> If adult education can be considered as the genus, then labor education can properly be thought of as a specialized species of the broader field. It is distinguished from adult education in the constituency it primarily serves, how that constituency is reached, the institutions that provide labor education services, and its values, goals, content, and methodology.[86]

Eiger continues to state the five priorities for the Center, in addition to basic trade union education:

1. providing understanding of racism and involving labor in urban problem-solving,
2. encouraging other educational institutions to aid in working people's learning,

3. refining concepts of work and leisure and promoting more productive use of leisure,
4. enhancing understanding of international labor, economic and social affairs,
5. producing instructional materials[87]

There is an obvious connection between these priorities and career education's promotion of lifelong learning. In the long run both groups will benefit if labor educators and career educators convene to discuss areas of mutual concern. The researchers of both fields, too, should explore and analyze the possibilities for future cooperation. Based on their past academic and instructional ventures, there should be in the future a prominent role for labor educators in the career education movement. Educators concerned with the educational needs of workers have understood historically the concept of lifelong learning better than most. Career education needs their experience, perspective and vision.

PART III -- CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

Some Tentative Conclusions

Though this is the end of this paper it may be only the beginning of the topic.

What we conclude based on the past relationships between labor and career education may be outdated, given the ongoing redefinitions of those relationships and their speedy evolution.

Nevertheless, we may return to the matters raised in the Introduction to assess where things stand now. In doing this, we must still keep in mind our caution, our issue, and our question.

The caution to remember that labor and education may be different than organized labor and the Office of Education remains appropriate. The evidence does seem to indicate that we have dealt with most if not all of the major issues through that union-OE focus, and that in the near future both OE and the unions will continue to define the papameters of the career education discussion.

It will be necessary, however, to explore other versions and visions of the education-work nexus to complete the picture. The research priorities of the National Institute of Education, for example, have been and will continue to be significant in structuring the career education environment. The approaches and projects of the Departments of Labor and Commerce, and of private organizations, are also informational resources.

In addition, the viewpoints of other educators and conceptualizers of career development must be utilized. Particularly through the critiques of a "loyal opposition," new directions in career education may emerge.

And in a somewhat different manner it is also important to maintain an awareness of the internal dynamics of the trade union movement. The potential shifts of emphasis and philosophy which may occur through the ascendancy to positions of power of new labor leaders are variables to consider. The realignments caused by rank and file groups within the unions, too, may prove to contribute modifications in labor attitudes toward career education programs.

If there is any method that can be devised to gain input from the ranks of unorganized workers, that opinion also will be useful. We may continue to focus, in other words, on the current leaders in the movement, but within our peripheral vision we need to keep other forces under observation.

The ideological implications of the "fundamental issue" we discussed in the Introduction remains one of the considerations for our future analysis. We can, in fact, link it up with the Introduction's "primary question" to suggest a crucial conclusion of this research.

Even after all the documentation and analysis of the preceding pages we are no closer to resolving this fundamental issue and answering this primary question than we were in the Introduction. In fact, by stressing the current situations and near-future probabilities, we actually may be a step further removed from resolution and solution.

We need to resolve the underlying theoretical critiques which have emerged recently not from the educational reformers mentioned previously but by the social critics thus far unmentioned. Such observers of the educational scene as Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis;[88] such scholars of work as James O'Toole[89]; and, most specifically, such critics of vocational/career education as Marvin Lazerson and Norton Grubb[90] have raised profound and as yet unresolved questions which career educators cannot avoid.

The task, then, for the career education movement is to move forward on two fronts. As seems now conventional, we can call one "theory" and the other "practice."

In practice career education must move beyond the demonstration phase and into the implementation phase and prove that the conceptual framework within which the reforms operate is valid. It is obvious on this front that trade unions have played and will continue to play a pivotal role in the movement's success or failure.

The broader theoretical questions, too, need responses. Career education has in general opted for the basic economic, political, and social forms of organization that define this country in the last half of the twentiety century. It is self-consciously reformist rather than revolutionary

But the adequacy of reform solutions in career development, in education, and in work, are exactly what are being called to task. In the adequacy of the career educators' theoretical defense, and in the implementation of the practical applications of that defense, lies the answer to those who challenge reform as inadequate. Perhaps fortunately, since it tends to sharpen the debate, it is not yet clear whether career education theory and practice does meet that challenge.

It may appear less obvious on the theoretical level that the labor movement is essential to the definitional process. But by their very nature they must constantly deal with fundamental issues-- of class, of race, of sex; of economic, political and social forms. Without the labor perspective on career education theory there may be no chance of constructing the reform rationale that needs to be articulated.

Our tentative conclusion, then, is best phrased in the form of a series of three questions which remain to be explored:

In what direction should our society move?

How will career education help or hinder that movement?

And how does the labor movement fit the direction of career education?

Note that our final questions have been consciously constructed to be impossible to answer simplistically and conventionally, with "yesses" or "noes."

An Action-Oriented Summary

In the preceding pages we have identified some of the issues and strategies related to the relationship of organized labor in the implementation of career education.

We indicated three levels of issue considerations: theoretical, conceptual, and operational. We considered two aspects of strategic planning: short-range implementation and long-range implications.

Among the theoretical considerations discussed were the following:

1. Hypotheses regarding the nature of work and the applicability of these to the theories held by labor leaders and career educators;

2. The expansion of educational theory to include not only formal schooling but also learning situations other than the school, particularly the mass media and specifically television;

3. Differing views of the transition between education and work and how this phase of career development is looked at by union leaders and educators.

Among the conceptual considerations raised were:

1. the problem of lack of definition of terms;

2. the relation of labor to public education;

3. the potential narrowing of choice in career education in labor's view;

4. the real prospects for the collaborative relationships outlined in career education tenets.

Among the operational considerations examined were these:

1. The "Turf" problem of what are appropriate areas for which social institutions;

2. Roles of participants in the schools and how changes in them may be useful or not so useful;

3. The importance of labor as a curricular subject in the viewpoint of each area;

4. The economic realities of the work-experience question, including ramifications of the debate over remuneration, protective labor laws, productivity, unemployment, and apprenticeship programs.

Implementation strategies considered were threefold:

1. Increasing the participation of organized labor in ongoing career development programs;

2. Reconsidering and revising the framework for work-experience;

3. Encouraging the development of labor studies programs in the school curriculum.

Three propositions were suggested as long-term possibilities:

1. Clarifying the positions of unions on career education and increasing their profile within the career education movement;

2. Expanding and modifying work-experience to accomodate union viewpoints;

3. Recognizing and consolidating the role of labor education in life-long learning programs.

Boiled down to the most significant essentials, the following five action-oriented recommendations are offered as methods to enhance the participation of labor in the implementation of career education:

1. Provide research support and investigate demonstration projects to analyze the uses of the mass media, particularly television, in modifying negative images of workers and unions and educating viewers on career development topics.

2. Encourage the quick elimination of class, sex and race bias in career education materials, classroom instruction, and guidance.

3. Appoint labor representatives, with full participation rights, to career education decision-making agencies at the federal, state and local levels; and, particularly and specifically, on the National Advisory Council on Career Education.

4. Resolve the quandary of divergent viewpoints on work-experience, primarily by following union recommendations and procedures where feasible, and secondarily by ensuring consensus via negotiated compromise in all other situations.

5. Incorporate in all future discussions of and plans for comprehensive career education programs a component oriented toward labor studies and history for which union and labor education input is solicited.

The result of good faith effort to act upon these recommendations should produce a series of further recommendations upon which the foundation of organized labor -- career education collaboration can be laid.

NOTES

[1] Cf., for example, the writings of Norman Gysbers or Keith Goldhammer for non-OE conceptual frameworks.

[2] Printed as a pamphlet, October, 1975; available from UAW, pp. 6-7.

[3] HEW Task Force Report, Work in America (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974), p. 2.

[4] Ibid., p. 3.

[5] Studs Terkel, Working (New York: Avon, 1975), p. xiii.

[6] Cf., for example, his papers "Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences," and "Career Education and Work Experience Education: Can We Join Together?" (February, 1976).

[7] This notion is of course a fundamental OE concept of career education and is found in nearly all of the writings on the subject with which OE is associated.

[8] Available as a reprint from the AFL-CIO.

[9] Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Career Education: A Proposal for Reform (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), p. 109.

[10] For example, the "employer (experience)-based model" and the "home-based model" explicitly go beyond the school (and the "school-based model") to take this into account.

[11] For a bibliography of relevant research on this subject, see F. Gerald Kline and Phillip J. Tichenor, editors, Current Perspectives in Mass Communications Research (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972). Also Ralph O. Nofziger and David M. White, editors, Methods of Research In Communication (New York: Houghton & Mifflin, 1970); George Comstock and George Lindsey, Television and Human Behavior: The Research Horizon, Future and Present (Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand, 1975).

[12] HEW, op. cit., p. 34-35.

[13] Paul Lauter and Florence Howe, The Conspiracy of the Young (New York: Meridian, 1971), p. 227.

[14] Available from Women on Words and Images, New Jersey.

[15] George Gerbner and Larry Gross, "Living With Television: The Violence Profile," Journal of Communication, Vol. 26, Number 2 (Spring 1976), p. 189.

[16] William H. McClennan, President, International Association of Firefighters, personal letter.

[17] The National Manpower Institute, Washington, D.C., was awarded a federal grant earlier this year to begin to implement some of Wirtz's strategies on a demonstration basis. Data on this project will accumulate over the next several years.

[18] Gus Tyler, "Career Education and Society's Imperatives," in Larry McClure and Carolyn Buan, editors, Essays on Career Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. 171-175.

[19] Willard Wirtz and the National Manpower Institute, The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education/Work Policy (Washington, D.C.: New Republic Book Company, 1975), pp. 169-182.

[20] Robert M. Strauber, Education Director, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, personal letter.

[21] See Kenneth B. Hoyt, "Obstacles and Opportunities in Career Education" (mimeo; remarks to the New Mexico Career Education Conference, June 7, 1976), pp. 6-8.

[22] Kenneth B. Hoyt, An Introduction to Career Education: A Policy Paper of the U.S. Office of Education (DHEW Publication No. (OE) 75-00504), p. 3.

[23] Terkel, op.cit., p. xi.

[24] See Hoyt, "Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences," passim.

[25] Hoyt, *Introduction*, *op. cit.*, p. 4-5.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[27] United Auto Workers, "Labor's Historic Support of Public Education: A Chronology" (Detroit, Mich.: UAW Publication No. 405, 1974), p. 1-2.

[28] Tyler, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

[29] Quoted in Sessions "Misdirecting Career Education."

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] Calvin M. McIntyre, personal letter.

[34] Kenneth B. Hoyt, "Career Education and the Business-Labor-Industry Community," (mimeo; paper for National Apprenticeship and Training Directors Conference, 1975), pp. 6-7.

[35] Marland, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-265.

[36] Kenneth R. Edwards, "Career Education: A Paper for Discussion" (mimeo; 1972), pp. 11-12.

[37] International Union of Operating Engineers, "A Critical Analysis of the Texas Education Agency-- United States Office of Education Career Education Construction Cluster Plan" (mimeo; 1973), p. 2.

[38] William E. Weisgerber, personal letter.

[39] Operating Engineers, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

[40] Frederick O'Neal, President, Associated Actors and Artistes of America, personal letter.

[41] American Federation of Musicians, "Music Is Your Business," "Young Sounds of the AFM," "The Music Code of Ethics" (provided by Dick Moore and Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.).

[42] Robert Leventhal, Administrative Assistant, Telecommunications International Union, personal letter.

[43] John A. Sessions, "Unions, Education, and Employment," Changing Education, Summer, 1973, p. 25.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Sessions, op. cit.

[46] McIntyre, personal letter.

[47] Quoted in Career Education News, February 1, 1976.

[48] Personal letter.

[49] Hoyt, "Career Education and Work Experience Education," op. cit., p. 8.

[50] Sessions, "Unions," op. cit., p. 27.

[51] Personal letter.

[52] Sessions, "Unions," op. cit., p. 27.

[53] Kenneth B. Hoyt, "Career Education's Potential for Increasing Productivity" (mimeo; paper for the National Federation of Independent Business, 1975), p. 2.

[54] Wirtz, op. cit., p. 94.

[55] Sessions, "Unions," op. cit., p. 27.

[56] Robert Lindsey, "Women Entering Job Market at an 'Extraordinary' Pace," New York Times, Sept. 12, 1976, p. 1.

[57] McIntyre, personal letter.

[58] "The AFL-CIO Platform Proposals: Presented to the Democratic and Republican National Conventions, 1976," p. 36.

[59] George A. Kanyok, Assistant Education Director, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, personal letter.

[60] George K. Daitsman, Education Director, International Union, Allied Industrial Workers of America, personal letter.

[61] Robert W. Dudnick, Assistant Director of Research and Information, The Newspaper Guild, personal letter.

[62] Hoyt, "Obstacles," *op. cit.*, *passim.*

[63] Hoyt, "Introduction," *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[64] John A. Sessions, "Unions as a Resource in Career Education" (mimeo; 1976), p. 7.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 10. Several correspondents, it should be noted here, have reported that they have not always successfully followed this advice, attributing their lack of success to recalcitrance on the local level.

[66] Al Lorente, "Remarks: U.S. Department of Commerce Hearings Held at Kellogg Center, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, Michigan" (mimeo' 1976), pp. 5-6.

[67] Al Lorente, "Text of Remarks Made at a Hearing Before Carl D. Perkins, Chairman, and Various Members of the House Committee on Education and Labor: (mimeo; 1976) p. 3.

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[70] Resolution No. 43, reproduced in Appendix.

[71] Resolution No. 20, reproduced in Appendix.

[72] Sessions, "Resource," *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[73] Lorente, "Text," *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[74] See Appendix.

[75] Sessions, "Unions," *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[76] *Ibid.*

[77] Richard O. Boyer and Herbert M. Morais, *Labor's Untold Story* (New York: United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, 1971), p. 11.

[78] Further information on these programs is available from the unions in each case. One interesting aspect of the AFL-CIO Labor Studies Center program is the relationship with Antioch College which certifies the bachelor of arts degree curriculum.

[79] See for example The Union Steward at Work: A Programmed Instruction Series (1973).

[80] Hal Kessler, "New Curriculum Package on Unions Now Available," The PFT Reporter [Philadelphia Federation of Teachers], May, 1973.

[81] Gus Tyler, "What Kind of Career Education?" (mimeo; 1973), pp. 17-18.

[82] Cf. pp. 5-8, p. 11, and pp. 12-13, respectively.

[83] Cf. pp. 13-14.

[84] "Trade Training," Guidepost, Sept. 9, 1976.

[85] "HRDI Enrolls Needy Youths In Jobs Project," AFL-CIO News, July 24, 1976.

[86] Norman Eiger, "Labor Education-- A Past and Future View," The New Jersey Adult Educator, Winter, 1975, p. 13.

[87] Ibid., p. 14.

[88] See Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life (New York: Basic, 1976). Also Christopher Jencks et al., Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America (New York: Basic, 1972).

[89] See James O'Toole, "The Reserve Army of the Underemployed," Change, May & June, 1975.

[90] W. Norton Grubb and Marvin Lazerson, "Rally 'Round the Workplace: Continuities and Fallacies in Career Education," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 45, No. 4 (November, 1975).

For additional background on this view, see also Marvin Lazerson and W. Norton Grubb, American Education and Vocationalism: A Documentary History 1870-1970 (New York: Teachers College Press, 1974).

Another recent critique worth considering is "Does Career Education Do Any Good?", Dollars & Sense, No. 19 (Sept., 1976).

APPENDIX

1. RESOLUTION: EDUCATION IN GENERAL

   16th IUE Constitutional Convention
   Chicago, Illinois
   September 9-13, 1974

2. UAW CAREER EDUCATION STATEMENT
   January, 1976

3. RESOLUTION NO. 43: EDUCATION AND WORK

   Submitted by: AFT Executive Council
   AFT Convention
   August, 1976

16th IUE Constitutional Convention
Chicago, Illinois
September 9-13, 1974

RESOLUTION

EDUCATION IN GENERAL

Every individual irrespective of class, sex or age should have the opportunity to acquire as much education as he desires in order to develop his full potential and thus play a meaningful role in society. Unfortunately, our educational system has failed in many ways to provide these opportunities:

1. It has failed to provide equal opportunities to our black, Spanish surnamed, Oriental, and Indian citizens.
2. It has failed to offer services to the poor which are equivalent to those offered people who are better off financially.
3. It has failed to eliminate functional illiteracy.
4. It has failed to provide adequate opportunities to our older citizens.

There are, however, some successes that we cannot overlook:

1. There is a trend towards democratization of educational opportunity.
2. Children have access to more years of education today than their parents received.
3. In higher education, about three times as many college-age youth are enrolled in institutions of higher learning as compared with enrollment prior to World War II.
4. A larger percentage of minority groups and working-class children are participating in higher education than ever before.

Fortunately, educational institutions are taking a deeper interest and involvement in the society as a whole. Throughout the country, community colleges have been setting up associate degree programs in Labor Studies. About 30 colleges and universities have extension programs to help train and educate union leaders and members.

Unions continue to operate in many ways to make additional educational opportunities possible for workers. Through the use of the tuition refund promising now in many IUE agreements, workers have an opportunity to expand their skills on the job, and more important are able to acquire knowledge in subjects and fields necessary to move ahead in their chosen occupation.

As in no other period of human history, we are living in a period of rapid change. Knowledge and skills we acquire must be updated to be useful to the lives of our children.

RESOLUTION NO. 20

We have been hearing a great deal recently about career education. Unfortunately, this concept is not clear but if it is to be successful it must relate career alternatives to the ongoing changes in our society and offer students realistic options.

As trade unionists, we must be informed of and take great interest in the educational proposals and innovations that continue to come on the scene.

Unfortunately, the Nixon Administration did little to carry out this nation's commitment to quality and equality in education. The Right to Read campaign is under-financed at a time when, according to the National Reading Council, more than 18 million Americans, aged 16 and over, cannot read well enough to function in society.

Our public libraries are being starved for funds and must curtail their programs.

Funds for career education approved by the Nixon Administration are being transferred from the Vocational Education Act and the Higher Education Act.

These are only a few of the obstacles to fulfilling the educational needs of our country.

In addition, the busing issue continues to divert time and attention from the basic issues of correcting the flaws of our educational system. By margins of only one or two votes the Senate in late May defeated attempts to block further school desegregation. It is ironic that the new attack on desegregation came almost on the eve of the 20th anniversary of the Supreme Court's Brown decision.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That America's priorities be reordered so that educational needs take precedence over all other demands.
2. That the IUE support the Women's Educational Equality Act which provides grants to develop non-sexist curriculum, non-discriminatory vocational and career counseling, sports education, and other such programs.
3. That sexism and racism, in every form, be removed from our educational system.
4. That the concept of progressive learning in "schools without walls" and similar educational innovations be encouraged.
5. That the IUE continue its fight for direct federal funding of the schools in this country in place of the obsolete and inadequate property tax and sales tax for school support.
6. That funding for vocational and adult education be increased, noting, however, that a complete vocational technical education should include all that is relevant in general education curriculum in addition to occupational skills and knowledge that are saleable in the marketplace.

RESOLUTION NO. 20

7. That the IUE together with the rest of the labor movement, continue to fight for increased funds for land-grant colleges and other higher educational institutions.

8. That the IUE support a program of 16 years of free public education for every young person--to be used in academic, technical or vocational training, including adequate supportive services in career guidance and counseling to ensure that every American achieves his full potential.

9. That the IUE recommend renewed local, state and federal efforts not only to end school segregation but to ensure that the schools will be meeting places for children of all races, ethnic backgrounds and economic means.

10. That the IUE support democracy in education which brings to the process of educational decision all who are involved in the process: students, teachers, parents and the community at large.

RESOLUTION NO. 20

January 1976

UAW CAREER EDUCATION STATEMENT

In recent months career education has blossomed on the education scene. Career education is a concept and educational delivery system designed to provide a learning vehicle so every student involved in the public education process will acquire basic skills, prepare for social participation and change, think creatively and critically, develop a strong self-concept, and learn vocational, technical and academic skills. Preparing young people for their roles as workers in the occupational field is an important part of the career education concept. It is also the type of education which should equip all students to perform effectively and contribute constructively to society.

Career education is a response to the call for educational reform of a system which has failed to respond viably to the educational needs of today's society. The UAW, along with other labor organizations, participated in the development of this reform.

The call for educational reform is a reaction to the many problems with conventional public education which have surfaced. Factors identified with these problems include:

- The low performance levels of graduating students, necessitating extensive remedial education.
- Education has not been related to actual living experiences.
- Public education fails some 2-1/2 million students annually. These are identified as high school dropouts, college dropouts, and students in the general education track.
- Students making the transition to a post-school environment face frustrating experiences, demonstrated by inability to relate effectively to the complexities of community and family structures.
- Failure to provide quality education to minority and economically disadvantaged students.
- Current public education stresses teaching rather than learning.

- Disproportionate emphasis toward college preparatory curriculums when compared to the actual need for baccalaureate degrees in today's job market.
- Failure of students to acquire and possess vocational, technical and academic skills.
- Functional illiteracy still prevails among more than 20 million adults.
- Lack of easy-access, easy-exit educational opportunities for adults and older citizens, with emphasis on life-long continuing education.

Career education, properly implemented, addresses itself to correction of these problems.

The UAW views a person's career as his or her whole lifetime, which includes the various life roles experienced by our populace. With little exception, all persons will be students, family members, and citizens, as well as workers. Career education relates to each of these life roles. Students must learn how to learn. This will provide the adaptability competencies necessitated by changing job conditions. Current statistics indicate the average person will change jobs some six times during a lifetime. New skills may be required along with refurbishing of old talents.

Substantial numbers of students in many schools are channeled into the so-called general curriculums. These curriculums are not geared to any special end result except graduation. Following graduation, these students have neither the ability to acquire entry-level jobs, nor the ability to absorb post-secondary education. Career education provides for acquisition of saleable skills by high school graduates who are not college-bound.

While part of the concept of career education provides that education should be preparation for work, the entire concept also stresses that public education must accomplish other things. Even though work is an important aspect of one's career, it does not represent the totality of lifetime. Cultural, aesthetic, and leisure-time activities must be considered. Earning a living is not the same as living a rich and rewarding life. The skills required to understand and cope with the problems of our culture and society must also be taught, as well as the skills to bring about those constructive changes a viable society constantly needs.

Development of the career education philosophy has been intensified by passage of legislation to promote it. The federal career education statute became law in August 1974. Currently, 19 states have either passed or are considering passage of career education legislation. But career education does not occur in a vacuum. Our intolerably high unemployment rate foreshadows the doom of any career education program. It seems clear that career education can only become meaningful when there are decent jobs available for everyone seeking work. Full employment is a fundamental need, and we need the national commitment to achieve this goal.

Career education is expected to create a citizen who is self-confident and culturally advanced; one who relates well to others, adapts to change, possesses both living skills and job skills, and who can manage the tools of his or her occupation. The UAW endorses the career education philosophy, and is willing to work with educators and others toward its successful implementation.

--O--

opeiu42:pms
January 14, 1976

August 1976

AFT
Convention

RESOLUTION NO. 43

EDUCATION AND WORK

Submitted by: AFT Executive Council

Comprehensive public education is the cornerstone of American democracy. Open access to an education that provides breadth of learning, depth of understanding and equal opportunity should be the right of every child and adult. Education programs which enlarge the learning experience have the effect of increasing opportunities for students and expanding their life choices. Education and work programs should also cause this result. The effect of such programs should be to raise aspirations and increase prospects for upward mobility.

The American Federation of Teachers believes that the purposes of education are both broad and varied. While an adequate education should provide students with the general intellectual skills to begin pursuing a variety of careers, career orientation is only part of this larger function. Education must prepare students to enrich themselves throughout their lifetimes. It must enable them to function as citizens who make basic economic, political and social choices well beyond the choice of a job. There is no such thing as being "overeducated." Job performance alone should never provide the total measure of the value of an education.

The efforts to relate education to job preparation are commendable. But they should not be built on false assumptions. High unemployment is not a result of educational failure. Those concerned with unemployment should look first to economic and job policies to solve unemployment problems. These might include support for public works and other job creating programs, tax policies which stimulate the economy, federal support for housing and construction programs, and an expanded federal role for education, health and welfare services, among others. As part of the AFL-CIO, the AFT recognizes that economic problems need economic solutions. The education sector should never accept blame for a youth unemployment problem it did not create.

The idea that there is need for a closer relationship between schooling and job preparation has recently grown in popularity. "Education and work," as the concept is termed, may refer to a broad range of programs including "career education," "lifelong," "recurrent," "continuing," and even "competency-based" education. In recognizing the potential misdirection of some well-intentioned education and work programs, the American Federation of Teachers urges locals and state federations to participate in the development of such programs and adopts the following guidelines with regard to their implementation:

- Expanded guidance and counseling services must be provided to all students. Career education programs which offer additional guidance—which expand upon the basic curriculum and which are aimed at career awareness—should be supported. Teachers may wish to use job resource persons in these programs, but such persons should be chosen by the teacher, and be under his or her supervision. Non-professionals should not be used in professional roles. Such programs should include accurate treatment of the role of labor unions and should deal with unions as well as employers in making job placements. In fact, such placement services should be expanded.

- Alternative programs which have a career orientation may be provided for students who cannot function in, or who do not obtain benefit from, regular school programs. While some of these may involve work experience, they must be carefully constructed so that they are clearly the responsibility of the public school system and are aimed at broadening rather than narrowing youth's educational experience.
- Where career education programs involve any kind of experience at the job site they should be tried only in industries where there is full employment and where no adult workers will be displaced. These programs must supplement a basic education and not act as a substitute for it.
- The AFT will resist the creation of programs which involve watering down child labor laws, providing for subminimum wages, lowering the the school-leaving age, or weakening health and safety laws related to work.
- The AFT strongly opposes career education programs that involve turning over some of the responsibility for public education to the private sector. Cooperative "education and work" community councils should in no way undermine the authority of publicly elected or appointed school boards. We oppose voucher plans that would subject both education and its consumers to the whims and prejudices of the marketplace.

The American Federation of Teachers believes that the most hopeful education and work programs have not yet been tried and urges those already involved in career education — as well as many others who may recognize the importance of expanded adult opportunities — to support the following proposals:

- Job training programs which build upon a basic education by combining further academic experiences with on-the-job experiences should be expanded. These might include internship programs for teachers, career ladder programs for paraprofessionals and others as well as apprenticeship programs.
- More information should be made available on job availability, occupational projections, job access, etc. Information which is available should be compiled and disseminated in some useful form.
- Adult education programs must be expanded. Such programs should service all adult educational needs whether they be for job training or retraining or for personal enrichment. They may take the form of worker sabbaticals, paid educational leave, deferred educational opportunity and the like. Programs that provide workers with recognized credentials should be available to them. Programs now offered by institutions of higher education that provide for career training should not be cut simply because they are expensive.
- Restrictions against the use of public schools by adults must be reexamined. Special programs which allow adults to return to school to complete a high school program should be implemented.

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1977 241-055/2052